



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 161

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 2015

No. 24

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
February 12, 2015.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EVAN H. JENKINS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 6, 2015, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

INTRODUCTION OF A MARIJUANA BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, for more than 70 years our government has followed the most spectacular failure in policy since the disastrous 13-year experiment with the prohibition of alcohol.

Forty-three years ago, the National Commission on Marijuana and Drug Abuse released a report, finding that the Federal ban on marijuana is un-

justified and inappropriate. Yet, for most of that time, Federal policy has been frozen in amber.

Countless lives have been ruined for the use of a substance that a majority of Americans think should be legal; untold billions of dollars have been spent on a failed effort at prohibition; and still 25 million adults use it every month.

Despite a finding in Federal law that marijuana is a schedule I controlled substance with no therapeutic value, 213 million Americans live in 34 States and the District of Columbia where medical marijuana is recognized and legal in some form, and over a million people use it as medicine.

In 1996, voters in California marked a significant change in course when they legalized medical marijuana with a vote of the people, and almost three dozen States have followed. In the fall of 2012, voters in the States of Washington and Colorado approved the adult use of marijuana, and it should be noted that the sky didn't fall, big cracks didn't appear in the Earth, and problems with marijuana didn't get worse. In some instances, they became more manageable.

For the Federal Government, the tide continues to turn. Last session of Congress had six successful votes on the floor of the House to rationalize our foolish policies, including reining in Federal enforcement and opening opportunities for legal industrial hemp cultivation. Last fall, voters in my State of Oregon, looking at the evidence and experience like in Colorado, approved adult use by an even larger margin than in the previous States.

The marijuana reform train has left the station, and it is time for the Federal Government to redouble its efforts on developing policies that work. Congressman JARED POLIS and I will reintroduce this week our legislation to establish a Federal framework to end the failed Federal prohibition.

It will pave the way for States to chart their own course to legalize, tax, and regulate marijuana according to what individual States want to do—just like they do with alcohol. We will save tens of billions of dollars on failed enforcement, incarceration, and lost revenue. We will choke off a profit center for drug cartels that has been enriched by our failed policies, and we will make it easier to enforce laws to keep marijuana out of the hands of our children and have money for government services rather than waste money on failed policy, arresting people for something that a majority of Americans now thinks should be legal.

For those of us who have worked in this field for years, it is an exciting time. My legislation will deal with the taxation of marijuana, and we look forward to refining it, to being able to have the tax at a proper level to support government services but also reasonable enough to choke off black market supply.

It is time for us to enter a new era of marijuana policy for research, for protecting our children, for economic development and individual liberties. I strongly urge my colleagues to examine the legislation that we have advanced and be part of this long overdue effort at reform.

STUDENT SUCCESS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, back in December, President Obama gave a major speech regarding the United States policy towards Cuba. The President said:

I do not believe we can continue doing the same thing for five decades and expect a different result.

In other words, the President is saying that, when something isn't working, we need to try a new approach.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H985

I wonder if the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle agree that we should apply that same standard to our Nation's education policy. As a former member of the Alabama State school board and as the former chancellor of postsecondary education for Alabama, I think it is time for a change.

For the last 50 years, Federal education policy has failed our students, especially our Nation's poor students, who need us the most. Just look at the statistics. Only 38 percent of high school seniors can read at grade level, and just 26 percent are proficient in math. Survey after survey shows that the United States is lagging behind other countries in terms of education.

We clearly need a new approach, and that is why I was proud to support the Student Success Act yesterday in our Committee on Education and the Workforce. For too long, the focus has been on the needs and wishes of Washington special interest groups instead of on the needs of those who matter the most—the students. It is time we change that. Immediately, two glaring flaws come to mind when looking at current policy:

First, our local teachers and administrators are drowning in paperwork and mandates. While only 10 percent of the funding for K–12 education comes from the Federal Government, the Government Accountability Office has found that 41 percent of the paperwork comes from the Federal level. That is unacceptable.

Second, title 1 funds, which are intended to support our Nation's most vulnerable, are picking and choosing winners by forcing money to some schools and by not allowing that money to others. The money should follow the student. We shouldn't allow students to remain stuck in failing schools. Every child deserves a fair chance.

Mr. Speaker, this top-down, heavy-handed Federal approach to education is not working, and, frankly, it is outdated. It is not the 1960s anymore: there are more than three television networks; we aren't all eating Wonder Bread; our phones aren't rotary phones tied to the wall; and our education system shouldn't be stuck in the sixties either. Instead of focusing on special interest groups, let's turn the focus to students, parents, and local leaders.

While the other side is always quick to point out the D.C. special interest groups, which stand by their failed approach, the Student Success Act is supported by the National School Boards Association, which is made up of more than 90,000 local school board members. These are the very people who are actually dealing with Federal education policy and how it actually works on the ground every day, and they want a new approach. Democrats and Republicans and these local school boards want a new approach.

Our teachers need the flexibility to innovate. That is why the Student Suc-

cess Act reforms a patchwork of narrowly scoped grant programs and, instead, creates a Local Academic Flexible Grant, which allows local schools to spark innovation and use teaching methods that work best for their students.

During committee debate yesterday, my colleagues on the other side were so committed to these same old, failed education policies that they even defended the universally disliked highly qualified teacher requirement. While I agree we need the best teachers possible in the classroom, who are Federal bureaucrats in Washington to decide what makes you highly qualified? Teachers in southwest Alabama and all across our country agree that the highly qualified teacher provision is simply not effective. Yet my colleagues on the other side and their special interest buddies refuse to give up power and allow us to move in a different direction.

It is time for the Federal Government to get some humility. Washington bureaucrats don't know how to educate our children, but local superintendents, school boards, teachers, and principals do, so let's empower them. It is time we restored local control over education policy and put power in the hands of those who know our students best. Let's put the focus on the student for once, and that is exactly what this act does.

I think the President may be on to something. We shouldn't continue with the same, failed education policy that has failed us for decades. We should get away from this centralized approach to education, which has failed the students throughout America. Mr. Speaker, the Student Success Act offers that new approach.

I urge the leadership of this House to bring the Student Success Act to the floor for a vote, and let's empower parents and local education leaders. For once, let's put the students first.

LYNCH-JONES RESOLUTION TO DECLASSIFY THE 28 PAGES OF THE 9/11 JOINT CONGRESSIONAL INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. LYNCH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, almost 14 years after the horrific terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, the American public does not yet have all of the information available regarding the circumstances surrounding those attacks on our country, particularly 28 pages of the bipartisan Joint Inquiry into Intelligence Community Activities Before and After the Terrorist Attacks of September 2001, which remain classified.

Since 2013, my colleagues, Congressman WALTER JONES of North Carolina, Congressman MASSIE of Kentucky, and I have been working together to craft and to garner support for H. Res. 14,

which calls on the President to release the 28 pages of the 9/11 Joint Congressional Inquiry. I sincerely appreciate Congressman JONES' and Congressman MASSIE's willingness to collaborate on this concerted effort on this issue.

Over the past few weeks, calls to declassify the 28 pages have been in the spotlight due to recent allegations by convicted terrorist Zacarias Moussaoui, who conspired to kill American citizens and who will rightly spend the rest of his life in prison. Whatever the motivations for Mr. Moussaoui's recent accusation of complicity by foreign agents in the 9/11 attacks, his testimony does bring to light important questions. Most notably is the fact that, as a nation, we have not yet fully accounted for the sources of funding and logistical support that enabled al Qaeda to undertake those terrorist attacks.

We owe it to the families who lost loved ones on that tragic day to provide a complete accounting of the events and circumstances leading up to the tragedy of 9/11, and it is a grave injustice that 28 pages of the bipartisan, bicameral congressional inquiry remain classified 14 years after September 11. This was not a mere redaction of a few specific words or phrases but the wholesale excising and removal of a full section, 28 pages in length. It may have been a matter of national security to classify these pages back in 2002, but it is now a matter of public interest and good governance to release them in 2015.

I am in firm agreement with former Senator Bob Graham of Florida, who oversaw the inquiry, with my colleague WALTER JONES of North Carolina, with Mr. MASSIE, and with Members of both parties, who, like myself, have read the 28 pages and believe the disclosure will not jeopardize sources or methods used in gathering this information. I firmly believe that declassifying the findings is appropriate for a number of reasons.

As Thomas Jefferson said:

An enlightened citizenry is indispensable for the proper functioning of a republic, and self-government is not possible unless the citizens are educated sufficiently to enable them to exercise oversight.

In other words, there can be no accountability without transparency. We must advocate for the need to make these pages public in order to shine a brighter light on the information contained therein and utilize it in framing our foreign policy going forward.

In addition, I have met with the spouses, children, siblings, parents of the 9/11 victims as well as with representatives from the 9/11 Families United for Justice Against Terrorism. They have provided powerful testimony and heartrending submissions regarding how important it is to seek the truth and to bring all those to account who were responsible for the 9/11 attacks.

□ 1015

Today, at a time when the world continues to face challenges from expanding terrorist organizations such as

ISIS, Jabhat al-Nusra, Boko Haram, and al Shabaab, as well as al Qaeda and its affiliates, we must be mindful of the urgent need to bring their financiers and supporters to justice as well.

At an even more basic level, our commitment to one another as citizens in a society that values freedom and justice demands that we hold accountable those who aided and abetted the savage attacks on our homeland and murdered thousands of innocent Americans.

When that fundamental duty to protect American citizens has been breached, it is not enough to say that we will “never forget.” The military and civilian personnel at the Pentagon, the first responders and office workers in the New York office towers, the passengers and crew of those hijacked planes, and all those families whose hearts still ache, we owe it to them.

So I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to not only take the time to review those 28 pages but also consider supporting House Resolution 14, as these families and the American people deserve to have their questions answered.

PRESIDENT OBAMA'S FISCAL YEAR 2016 BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off with a positive note. Just recently, President Obama submitted the Federal budget on time for the first time since 2010. While I appreciate his timeliness, I, and the constituents in my district, don't appreciate, however, his disregard for fiscal responsibility.

The President sent a budget to Congress which starts the fiscal year with our country in the red. What organization starts off the fiscal year by saying they are going to purposefully spend more money than they take in? How many folks around a dinner table actually have their conversation at the start of the year saying, “You know what? I want to start the year broke and I want to end broke.” That is what the President's budget does.

The President presented to Congress a \$4 trillion budget, and yes, you heard me right, that is trillion with a T. The proposed budget requests \$4 trillion in spending but only provides—catch this—\$3.5 trillion in revenue. I was not the best math student but I can see a problem here. That leaves the government with a half-trillion-dollar deficit.

Wait. Hold on a second. Let me go back and correct myself. I misspoke. That leaves the U.S. taxpayers with a half-trillion-dollar deficit because, let me remind you, the government makes nothing. Everything we spend comes from right here in my pocket, your pocket, and the pocket of everyone else in this country.

Now, I just checked, and the population of the United States is slightly over 320 million. So every man, woman,

and child would have to add an additional \$1,500 onto what they already owe in taxes—to include newborns—in order for this budget to even break even. And that is just for 2016.

The President's budget is a political document that reflects a very different view of fiscal responsibility than most people have.

Let's go through it and discuss the good, the bad, and the ugly of this budget.

First, the good. Now it is true that our national deficit is shrinking. Is it because of the President's policies? No. It is because of the ingenuity and determination of the American people. The private sector is now growing—and has been for a while—even as the administration has attempted to stifle businesses with antigrowth policies like ObamaCare and other regulations that continue to put sand in the gears of American business.

Even in the President's own budget document he cites economic growth as helping accelerate the pace of deficit reduction. He likes to go around the Nation and do speeches on how the deficit has decreased to its lowest level in decades during his Presidency. The inconvenient truth is that he decides to leave out that the biggest drops occur after 2010, when the Republicans took control of the House of Representatives.

The Republicans were able to garner concessions on reductions in spending. Plus, sequestration entered the fray, which aided in the decrease of federal expenditures. While sequestration is not the budget tool Congress would have hoped for, the President is now trying to capitalize off of this budget negotiation side effect.

President Clinton likes to take credit for the budget surpluses in the nineties, which were a result of the Republicans' Contract with America. Now, President Obama wants to take sole credit for a decrease in the deficit, a reduction in spending that he has had to make do with.

The bad. The President wants to raise taxes on Americans at the worst possible time—as we are emerging from the financial crisis. President Obama's tax proposals target job creators and the middle class. One such proposal was so egregious that even the Democrats said, We can't go along with this.

The President had a tax proposal to cut tax benefits on college savings plans. The 529 college plans are a means by which close to 12 million families save for college, many of them middle class Americans. That comes at a time when student loan debt is approaching a trillion dollars.

Hidden deep in Obama's budget is a student loan program that recently has been discovered to have a \$21.8 billion shortfall. His plan to subsidize student loans has now created a loss equal to the annual budgets of the Department of the Interior, EPA, and NASA.

The ugly. In President Obama's budget he discusses that by 2025 the Federal

debt will have reached 73.3 percent of GDP. That is almost three-fourths of our Nation's collective wealth. The President defines the country's \$18 trillion debt as being fiscally sustainable.

For him, 73 percent of our GDP is acceptable:

The key test of fiscal sustainability is whether debt is stable . . . as a share of the economy, resulting in interest payments that consume a stable . . . share of the Nation's resources.

Figure that one out.

The most disheartening part is the President's numbers are incorrect. The Congressional Budget Office, a non-partisan analytical wing of Congress, has stated that by 2025, the Federal debt will actually rise to nearly 79 percent of GDP, when the Federal debt would be \$26.3 trillion. CBO states that our debt is currently 74 percent of GDP.

The question you are asking now is: What is causing this increase in government spending? I bet you know the answer but I am going to tell you anyway. The CBO lists many factors, all of which are contributing to a bust in our Federal spending.

With that, this budget is another example of what does not need to be.

REMEMBERING JIMMIE LEE JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to celebrate the life and legacy of Jimmie Lee Jackson.

Jimmie Lee Jackson was one of the foot soldiers who died to ensure that all Americans have the fundamental right to vote.

This 26-year-old Marion, Alabama, native was brutally killed at the hands of an Alabama State trooper on February 18, 1965, after attending a voting rights rally while trying to protect his mother and his 82-year-old grandfather.

The State trooper confronted the family at Mack's Cafe in Marion and shot Jimmie Lee Jackson at gunpoint range for simply shielding his family from the intimidation and retributions being carried out by law enforcement.

And to think that this occurred because of the audacity of this young man and his family to peacefully protest for their constitutional rights, which led to his brutal murder at the hands of law enforcement.

It was the senseless murder of Jimmie Lee Jackson that served as a catalyst for the voting rights movement in Selma, Alabama. Jimmie Lee Jackson deserves to have his proper place in American history as a true agent of change.

Likewise, the city of Marion is, rightly, the starting point of the historic road to voter equality that led marchers from Selma to Montgomery. I have sponsored efforts and look forward to the National Park Service adding the city of Marion to the historic trail from Selma to Montgomery.

The senseless killing of Jimmie Lee Jackson shocked the consciousness of the American public and galvanized local leaders to be even more resolved in their fight against the inequalities in voting.

Who was to blame for the death of Jimmie Lee Jackson? Dr. Martin Luther King professed, as he eulogized Jimmie Lee Jackson at his funeral, we are all to blame for his murder. Dr. King said it best:

A State trooper pointed the gun, but he did not act alone. He was murdered by the brutality of every sheriff who practices lawlessness in the name of law.

He was murdered by the irresponsibility of every politician, from Governors on down, who has fed his constituent the stale bread of hatred and the spoiled meat of racism.

He was murdered by the timidity of a Federal Government that would spend millions of dollars a day to keep troops in South Vietnam and cannot protect the rights of its own citizens seeking the right to vote.

He was murdered by the cowardice of every Negro who passively accepts the evils of segregation and stands on the sidelines in the struggle for justice.

Justice should be blind, Mr. Speaker, but in many cases it is not. Everyone knew who killed Jimmie Lee Jackson, but it wasn't until 40 years later, when Michael Jackson, Dallas County's first Black district attorney, reopened the investigation, that the wheels of justice slowly began to turn.

Yesterday, this august body unanimously passed H.R. 431, a bill that would award a Congressional Gold Medal to the foot soldiers who participated in Bloody Sunday, Turnaround Tuesday, or the final march from Selma to Montgomery. It is past due, Mr. Speaker, that these brave men and women take their proper place as agents of change in American history.

While Jimmie Lee Jackson did not live to participate in the march from Selma to Montgomery, he was there in spirit. It was his spirit that gave strength to the weak, that gave courage to the scared, and that gave hope to the hopeless.

To his family, I say this Nation owes his family a debt of gratitude which we can never repay. My hope is that this national recognition of the significance of the death of Jimmie Lee Jackson will spur a renewed commitment in all of us to continue to fight for justice and equality for all.

We, the beneficiaries of that struggle, must continue his fight. We must continue to stand together. We must continue to be united in the fight for justice everywhere it is needed. Jimmie Lee Jackson did not stand on the sidelines waiting patiently for justice to come, nor should we.

Dr. King once said:

If you can't fly, then run. If you can't run, then walk. If you can't walk, then crawl. But whatever you do, you have to keep moving forward.

We must continue to stand together because our greatest and biggest fights are yet to come. We still need Federal oversight to ensure that every eligible

voter in these United States is able to cast their ballot and that every vote matters.

Jimmie Lee Jackson recognized the importance of the vote. He recognized the power of the ballot box. We owe it to ourselves and to the memory of Jimmie Lee Jackson to continue his fight.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRE-K

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I come here today to the House floor to address an extremely important and timely topic for our Nation: investing in high-quality pre-K education. It is really imperative to the success of our children, schools, and communities.

Two years ago, in this Chamber, President Obama laid out his plan to provide universal high-quality pre-K for every child in America. Why did the President propose such a bold and audacious plan for our country? It is really simple. It has been proven that children who participate in high-quality prekindergarten programs are more likely to have greater academic and life achievements down the road.

The benefits of a high-quality pre-K education include increased eagerness and preparedness to learn; higher reading, writing, and mathematics scores; and increased cognitive and social abilities. Access to quality pre-K is a much better predictor of achievement than race, family income, or parents' education.

Research has demonstrated that access to prekindergarten programs have substantial long-term benefits. Children that have attended prekindergarten are 20 percent more likely to graduate from high school and 22 percent more likely to own a home. Additionally, these individuals are more likely to be employed and less likely to commit violent crimes.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that saddens me the most about my home State of Texas is that we are leaving a lot of really bright young people behind.

□ 1030

Nearly 550,000 preschool-aged children in Texas do not attend any type of pre-K program, despite what I laid out earlier about less likely to commit violent crimes, more likely to own homes. You would think it would be a no-brainer and we would be committing more towards pre-K education.

Leaving behind this many children, 550,000—over half a million—really does pose a serious, long-term economic effect to our great State and is something that needs to be addressed. It is apparent that high-level prekindergarten education produces individuals that are more prosperous and more likely to contribute to society in a positive way.

To help States like my own boost their pre-K education programs, Presi-

dent Obama and the Department of Education delivered on his State of the Union Address, and they released Preschool Development Grants. These grants will help expand high-quality preschool programs in targeted communities.

When the announcements were made in December—again, I have got to tell you, we do a lot of great things in Texas, and we often do it bigger and better—but I was really disappointed, Mr. Speaker, to learn that our State had lost out on \$120 million of this grant funding to invest in our children and really, ultimately, our future—\$120 million that the great State of Texas lost out on, over half a million kids being left behind. This was really a sad day in the Lone Star State.

This money would have been used to improve pre-K education and expand access to children in low-income communities who need these services the most, and losing out on this money should really be a wake-up call to Texas and the policymakers there, that we must create a plan to improve our pre-K system.

Texas failed to meet even the minimum requirements of this application to provide at least a 50 percent increase in preschool slots available, and that is just really unacceptable.

My State needs a comprehensive pre-K plan that works to increase access to high-quality programs, set higher learning standards, improve curriculum, and increase teacher training. All those really are very, very important keys.

The failure to invest in our young children is a failure to invest in our future. Here in Congress and back home, I intend to work tirelessly to provide for the best education system that our Nation can provide.

But there are some bright spots. I talked about how the State, because of the failed application policy that was just really handled poorly, how we lost out on \$120 million and over half a million kids are suffering because of that, but I do think that it is important that I point out some of the positives.

There has been some bipartisan work along these efforts on pre-K, and I do want to thank one of my former colleagues in the State legislature, State Representative Eric Johnson of Dallas, and a lady that I did not serve with out of Georgetown, Texas—near Austin—Marsha Farney of Georgetown, to not only increase pre-K funding by \$300 million, but also improve curriculum, teacher training, and lower student-teacher ratios.

In this global economy that we live in today and tomorrow, students won't be competing for jobs in the workplace with neighboring States but will be competing with kids and students from all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, let's do this for Texas. Let's do the right thing. Let's help these children.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 33 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer:

Dear God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

We ask Your special blessing upon the Members of this people's House. They face difficult decisions in difficult times, with many forces and interests demanding their attention.

In these days, give wisdom to all the Members, especially as they consider the most serious matter of engaging in military activity. Bless as well those who inform them of the issues with honest frankness, knowing of the dangers implied and so many uncertain consequences.

Bless the men and women of this Chamber, O God, and be with them and with us all this day and every day to come. May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BROWNLEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. BROWNLEY of California led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

OBAMACARE DATA SECURITY

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, last week, more than 80 million Americans lost personal information when health insurer Anthem was hacked. Almost immediately, Anthem customers started to receive suspicious email messages trying to con them.

Anthem, Target, Home Depot, Sony—the list goes on and on of major hacks in the last year. In many of these cases, those who had their information stolen did not receive notice of the compromise promptly—the best way for them to protect themselves.

Because of ObamaCare, Federal and State governments now host a massive trove of private information. In hearing after hearing last year, we heard about the vulnerabilities of these systems.

In order to protect consumers, the House passed my Health Exchange Security and Transparency Act, which would require the government to inform consumers of a breach within 2 days. This bill passed with an overwhelming veto-proof majority but went nowhere in HARRY REID's Senate.

I have now reintroduced this bill, a commonsense measure to protect consumers if ObamaCare is the next major target for hackers. Maybe this year the Senate will act.

FUND DHS

(Mr. SCHIFF asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in urging the Republican leadership to advance bipartisan legislation that will keep the American people safe by continuing to fund the Department of Homeland Security.

On behalf of the dedicated men and women at the Department of Homeland Security—those who screen passengers traveling into and out of the country, those who ensure that our borders and shores are protected, and those who enforce the deportation of dangerous criminals—let's put aside partisan politics and come together on one thing we can all agree on: to prioritize the safety and security of the American people.

As the tragedies of recent events abroad have demonstrated, we can ill-afford another day of inaction by this Congress. The clock is running out. Sixteen days. Let's do our job. The American people expect better and they deserve better. Let's vote on a clean spending bill today.

UNSUSTAINABLE DEBT UNDER
PRESIDENT OBAMA

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in July 2008, then-Senator Barack Obama said that President Bush adding to the national debt was

“irresponsible” and “unpatriotic.” In February 2009, President Obama warned congressional leaders that the rate of government spending was unsustainable and pledged to cut the deficit.

Clearly, his words did not translate into actions. The deficit has tripled since President Obama took office. Now, the President's recent budget last week provides for \$8.5 trillion in new debt and does not ever balance. Republicans, led by Chairman PAUL RYAN, will produce a positive budget which balances.

The current rate of government spending is putting America's youth at risk with skyrocketing interest payments. I will keep working to promote policies that reduce our debt, cut wasteful spending, and create jobs while maintaining vital defense funding to promote peace.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and may the President, by his actions, never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

FUND DHS

(Mr. ISRAEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by reading a quote from today's Politico:

A faction of House and Senate conservatives is pushing Republican leaders to take the battle over the Homeland Security Department to the brink, arguing the party would win the public relations war with Democrats if a standoff over immigration led to a shutdown of the agency.

A public relations war. This is about the war on terror. In 16 days, the people who protect us from that war will lose their jobs or have to work without pay. We are 16 days away from a shutdown of the Department of Homeland Security and instead of planning how to protect us from our enemies, DHS is preparing contingency budgets in case this Republican Congress decides to shut them down.

To protect themselves from their political base in a fight on immigration, Republicans are willing to disrupt the protection of the American people in our communities, at our airports, our ports, and our borders.

Mr. Speaker, the bad guys have to be watching this and saying: Are you serious?

We should be serious about our homeland security and our economic security.

REMEMBERING DEAN SMITH

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, the State of North Carolina lost a legend both on and off the court when former University of North Carolina basketball coach Dean Smith passed away.

During his 36-year tenure as head coach, Smith led the Tar Heels to 879 wins and 13 ACC tournament championships. His teams reached the Final Four 11 times and won two national titles. He also coached the U.S. men's basketball team to an Olympic Gold Medal in 1976.

But Smith was more than just a college basketball icon. He was a deeply religious man who placed a strong emphasis on education. More than 96 percent of his players received their degrees. An unwavering supporter of civil rights, he recruited the first Black scholarship athlete at UNC.

While he never sought accolades for his actions, he received the Presidential Medal of Freedom, which is the Nation's highest civilian honor, in 2013.

Coach Smith was a remarkable man, and North Carolina was lucky to call him one of our own.

VETERANS HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENT ACT

(Ms. BROWNLEY of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. BROWNLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I am so honored to serve a second term as ranking member of the House Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee on Health. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to help Ventura County's veterans and veterans across America access VA health care and benefits and to break down bureaucratic barriers to care at the VA.

There is no commitment I take more seriously than to the men and women who have served our country. That is why I introduced the Veterans Health Care Improvement Act as my first bill in the 114th Congress. My bill would help guarantee adequate resources for veterans health care benefits by requiring the GAO to continue verifying the accuracy and adequacy of the VA's budget for medical care.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation with me.

REMEMBERING PRESIDENT LINCOLN

(Mr. HULTGREN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the birthday of a man whose name is synonymous with my home State of Illinois, the Land of Lincoln. It is the time of year when we remember the great deeds of our Presidents and their important actions in times of crisis.

President Lincoln knew crisis. Generations note his firm resolve in the face of a "House divided against itself"; his faithfulness in serving a country when half of it was bent and betting on his failure; and his growing faith in the "gracious hand which preserved us in peace and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us."

Our Nation was on the verge of collapse, but he never wavered, he never tired, he never backed down from the challenge. He challenges us to rise to the "great tasks" before us and meet them head on.

GOP DHS TANTRUM

(Mr. YARMUTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call on my Republican colleagues to not let their immigration reform politics weaken border security, paralyze our ports, and shut down the Department of Homeland Security created in the wake of 9/11.

If we do not pass a clean funding bill, more than 20 percent of FEMA personnel will be furloughed, crippling our ability to respond to disasters; management and support of our entire homeland security infrastructure would shut down; and essential personnel would be forced to work without pay.

That is 40,000 Border Patrol agents and Customs officers risking their lives for free because of a political stunt. That is 50,000 TSA screeners who guard our nationwide travel, keeping the USA safe, yet going without pay because the Republican leadership is putting politics ahead of security. And it is more than 40,000 Active Duty Coast Guard officers standing guard on our shores, proudly serving a country whose political leaders don't seem to care if they get paid for their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, the stakes are too high. The risk is too real. Republicans need to stop their anti-immigrant tantrum and end this dangerous game. Pass a clean DHS funding bill today to protect our great Nation.

A "NO" VOTE ON PRESIDENT'S AUTHORIZATION REQUEST

(Mr. MCCLINTOCK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, when we send our soldiers into harm's way, we have a solemn obligation to back them with the full might and resources that our country can muster and to give them the widest possible latitude for action. MacArthur was right:

In war, there is no substitute for victory.

The President proposes something very different: war by half measure; war on the cheap; war with dangerous restrictions on our troops; war with no clear objective other than to pull out in 3 years.

I will not vote for the authorization that the President has requested. Given his obvious irresolution, I think the best immediate course for the United States is to assure that the regional powers currently engaged against the Islamic State have the material support they require.

DHS SPENDING BILL

(Mr. SARBANES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the Republican leadership to bring a clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security to this floor.

The Department of Homeland Security provides vital programs and services that ensure the American public's safety. This Congress must also ensure that DHS has adequate funding to continue its important and effective work protecting our borders, our ports, our aviation systems, and all of our communities across the country. Without funding, DHS will be forced to shut down critical counterterrorism and natural disaster programs that safeguard millions of Americans.

It is the height of irresponsibility for Republicans to hold DHS funding hostage for the sole purpose—and the dangerous purpose—of partisan politics. Instead of putting forth a clean DHS funding bill, Republicans put forward legislation that is littered with unrelated policy riders.

We all agree that withholding funding for DHS is bad for our Nation's safety and security, so let's pass a clean DHS funding bill and debate these separate issues on their own merits. It is time for the House to pass a clean DHS funding proposal and stop playing games with the safety and the security of the American people.

□ 1215

HONORING THE SERVICE OF CORPORAL C.G. BOLDEN

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of U.S. Army Corporal C.G. Bolden, a Clinton, Arkansas, native and veteran of the Korean conflict.

In January 1951, Corporal Bolden was taken prisoner of war in Korea; and at that time, his wife, Geraldine, and 3-year-old son, Larry, were notified that he was missing in action. Tragically, that same year, Corporal Bolden died of malnutrition under horrific conditions in a North Korean POW camp.

In 1993, his remains were among those returned to the United States, and through innovative DNA testing, scientists at the Joint POW/MIA Accounting Command identified Corporal Bolden's remains and determined his cause of death.

On February 21, after decades of unanswered questions, Corporal Bolden will be laid to rest in his hometown of Clinton, Arkansas, and I am honored to join his family to remember him and welcome him home.

Corporal Bolden gave the ultimate sacrifice for his country, and his life is an example for all Americans and all

Arkansans. I thank him and his family for their service and their sacrifice.

REPUBLICANS ARE PLAYING A DANGEROUS GAME OF CHICKEN WITH AMERICA'S SECURITY

(Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, 16 days—House Republicans are playing a dangerous game of chicken with America's security, threatening to shut down the Department of Homeland Security unless we give in to their extreme demands on immigration; threatening to force DHS employees on the front lines who keep us safe—people in the Border Patrol, TSA, the Coast Guard—to go to work and risk their lives while they are not getting paid; threatening to furlough DHS workers who support the frontline folks by training new agents, purchasing new equipment, and collecting intelligence.

Republicans are wasting our time on an unnecessary and dangerous showdown when they should be focusing on economic growth, creating new jobs, and increasing hardworking Americans' paychecks, so that we can preserve and expand the middle class in this country.

I call on my colleagues in the Republican Party to abandon these unacceptable tactics, pass a clean DHS funding bill for the remainder of 2015, and start focusing on creating new jobs and increasing Americans' paychecks.

AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT

(Mr. STUTZMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, workers and small businesses all across the country have suffered greatly in Obama's economy. Over 90 million people are not participating in our workforce, and wages have remained stagnant, creating a squeeze on the middle class.

Expanding the size of government by raising taxes and increasing regulations will not help America recover; instead, working Americans are counting on us to make it easier and not harder to find opportunities so that they can earn a steady paycheck and provide for their families.

I ask my colleagues to support America's Small Business Tax Relief Act, legislation that the House will vote on tomorrow, sponsored by Congressman TIBERI. I know, from traveling my district in Indiana, that small businesses are the backbone of our economy, and this bill will allow job creators to deduct expenses and investments for new equipment the year that they are purchased, making it easier for businesses to grow.

This legislation could help produce tens of thousands of jobs and add billions of dollars in economic output.

Tomorrow, let's stand for common sense and pass a bill that will help kick-start our economy and make it easier for small businesses and workers to succeed.

THE RECKLESS AND IRRESPONSIBLE LEGISLATIVE JOYRIDE

(Mr. JEFFRIES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, in 16 days, House Republicans are prepared to shut down the Department of Homeland Security.

Once again, you are taking the American people on a reckless and irresponsible legislative joyride that is destined to crash and burn. You are taking the American people on a collision course that will damage the safety and security of the American people at a time when terrorists all across the world are determined to do us harm.

Why would you contemplate shutting down the Department of Homeland Security at this time—or at any time—simply in order to satisfy the extreme rightwing of your party?

The American people want us to focus on bigger paychecks, they want us to focus on good-paying jobs, they want us to focus on strengthening the middle class, but you are determined to shut down the Department of Homeland Security. It is reckless and irresponsible.

Let's get back to doing the business of the American people.

END SEQUESTRATION

(Mr. RIGELL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RIGELL. Mr. Speaker, this Congress must address the defense sequester with the urgency that is warranted. Our men and women in uniform are fighting bravely around the world, and they depend on the certainty of knowing that they have got everything they need to accomplish their mission.

The way to achieve that certainty is made increasingly difficult because of sequestration and the indiscriminate cuts that are affecting our men and women in uniform. I respectfully remind my colleagues today that as we start this budget and appropriations process, that we have the opportunity to replace sequestration in the months ahead.

Last year, House Republicans passed not only a budget in a timely manner, but we incorporated increased defense spending to ease the burden of sequestration.

Regardless of which side of the aisle we are on today, we all have a deep obligation to pass on the blessings of liberty and freedom to future generations.

In order to accomplish that, we can no longer allow Federal budget policy to be dictated by a process that neither side intended to go into effect.

I encourage my colleagues to make ending sequestration the top priority in the 114th Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY SHUTDOWN THREAT

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, national security—protecting our Nation's borders, airports, and computer networks—should be a priority.

Making sure the Department of Homeland Security, created with bipartisan support in the wake of September 11, has what it needs to protect our Nation from terrorism and other threats is a no-brainer, but the Republicans are jeopardizing all of that just for the opportunity to tell millions of hardworking, aspiring Americans that they are not welcome here.

This tactic of "my way or no way" is dangerous and serves the interests of a few at the expense of the many. Holding our top national security agenda hostage because the Republican majority is unhappy with the President's executive action on immigration is illogical and counterproductive.

In fact, former DHS Secretaries from both parties have warned that this approach will actually weaken—not strengthen—our borders.

The American people deserve better. They expect us to set partisan politics aside and ensure that government has the resources it needs. I urge my colleagues to listen to the needs of the American people and bring a clean DHS funding bill to the floor.

WHY MARRIAGE MATTERS

(Mrs. HARTZLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of National Marriage Week. It is an honor to promote an institution that has been the cornerstone of society for centuries, and I am blessed to celebrate this week with my husband of 30 years, Lowell Hartzler.

When a man and woman join together in holy matrimony, they are not only starting a life together and creating a family, they are also establishing the foundation of a healthy society.

Researchers document many benefits to marriage: better health, greater personal happiness, enhanced financial stability, and positive impacts for children. Boys and girls raised at home by a mom and dad perform better in school, have less addictions, experience lower rates of teen pregnancy, and see less trouble with the law.

At a time when some question the future of marriage, I think it is wise to

reflect on the unique benefits the intact, married family provides. Social science clearly tells us that marriage leads to greater wealth, health, longevity, and happiness. It is something to aspire to, to treasure, and to fight for.

Not only does society benefit but, most importantly, so do the men and women who commit to a lifetime of love, laughter, faithfulness, and future generations.

FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Mr. GALLEG0 asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Speaker, there are only 16 days left until the Department of Homeland Security runs out of money. How did we find ourselves in this situation?

Unfortunately, my Republican colleagues decided to play political games with our national security. They decided to pass a DHS funding bill they knew the Senate would not approve and the President would not sign. They decided deporting DREAMers and the parents of American children was more important than funding the Department that helps protect the American people.

Thankfully, there is an easy solution to this manufactured crisis. The Republican leadership could bring up a clean bill this afternoon, and it would pass with strong bipartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, our most critical responsibility as Members of Congress is to ensure that the men and women charged with protecting our Nation have the resources to do their jobs.

It is time for the Republican leadership to stop playing games and start living up to this basic obligation by bringing a clean DHS funding bill to the floor.

ENDING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND GIRLS

(Mr. DOLD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise as a son, a husband, a father of two daughters, a brother of three sisters, and I am proud to stand with 1 Billion Rising Lake County to end violence against women and girls everywhere.

One woman in three will be abused in her lifetime, totaling 1 billion across our globe. Mr. Speaker, 1 Billion Rising gives mothers, wives, daughters, sisters, neighbors, and friends who have suffered from abuse the opportunity to be heard and to join a supportive community.

Together, we must be the voice of those who cannot speak up and to take action to help those who are asking for help. We must take the lead on this issue and set an example for the world, ensuring that women everywhere can

live and thrive without fear of becoming a victim of violence.

I am committed to taking action to stop abuse, no matter what form it takes, and I ask everyone to join me and rise with 1 Billion Rising to stand strong against these disturbing crimes.

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, last week, America got some great economic news. Businesses added over 267,000 jobs in January, extending the longest streak on record of consecutive private sector job growth to 59 months.

We also set another record when the House, led by the Republicans, voted for the 56th time to repeal the Affordable Health Care Act.

Our economy added 3 million private sector jobs in the last 12 months, including over a million jobs in the last 3 months alone; yet instead of capitalizing on this success in order to help grow the middle class and add more jobs, the majority just continues to vote to take away health care.

Enough is enough. Thanks to President Obama and the Democrats, this economy has recovered from the worst recession on record. As you can see, the blue shows when President Obama took office, and then we grew out of the loss of jobs and have been gaining jobs.

□ 1230

HONORING MIKE COLLINS

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mourn the passing of Mike Collins.

Mike Collins epitomized what a true public servant is. Mike was a marine, a city councilman, mayor, police officer, and he epitomized that public service of never putting yourself above the people you represent. He always put the people he represented first. With his passing, northwest Ohio has lost a great leader.

Mr. Speaker, with his funeral today, I want to extend my deepest sympathies to his wife, his daughters, and his family.

FUNDING THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on the importance of funding the Department of Homeland Security. Playing partisan politics with DHS for ransom because you are unhappy with the President's executive order on immigration is inappropriate.

There are only 16 days—more importantly, there are only 6 legislative days—remaining before the Department of Homeland Security runs out of money. This is America's security at stake.

The events in Paris recently showed us that terrorism remains a threat around the world. It is also a domestic threat.

Why in the world would we want to put American citizens at risk, in harm's way?

Yet the majority seems to be content to risk our national security by defunding Homeland Security. It is either my way or the highway. The opposition insists that Congress dismantle the administration's immigration priorities, but they have yet to offer or bring a solution to the floor to fix our broken immigration system. If you have a better approach, then bring it to the floor for debate and we will vote on it.

In the valley that I represent, the San Joaquin Valley, this bill would have a devastating effect on farmworkers, farmers, and farming communities.

I ask us to come together. Let's fund Homeland Security and put the American people first.

RECOGNIZING FEBRUARY AS NATIONAL CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise as cochair of the bipartisan Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus in order to recognize February as National Career and Technical Education Month.

With my friend and cochair, JIM LANGEVIN of Rhode Island, the CTE Caucus remains focused on ensuring individuals have access to high-quality career and technical education programs.

In the previous Congress, a bipartisan CTE Caucus was successful in highlighting the need for robust funding for the Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. As we begin working on funding for fiscal year 2016, again our priority will be focused on ensuring adequate funding for CTE programming across the country.

Now, more than ever, our young people need assurances that the skills that they attain will lead to good-paying, family-sustaining jobs. CTE programming can make those assurances.

Mr. Speaker, as we celebrate National Career and Technical Education Month, I encourage all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us as members of the bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus.

CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION MONTH

(Mr. LANGEVIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my good friend and colleague, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, in recognition of Career and Technical Education Month. As cochair of the Congressional CTE Caucus, we are absolutely committed to ensuring that every student has the ability to achieve his or her career goals.

Mr. Speaker, it is long past time to reauthorize the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act. I certainly look forward to working with all my colleagues on this important legislation.

This year the CTE Caucus will also focus on expanding apprenticeships and employer-educator partnerships, as well as helping school counselors to provide students the information necessary to make informed career decisions.

To that end, I encourage all of my colleagues to join us on the Congressional CTE Caucus and also to cosponsor the bipartisan Counseling for Career Choice Act that we will introduce later this month that will ensure that school counselors have all the job training information that they need to understand in order to advise their students about the good-paying jobs that will be available to them in the future.

I want to thank, again, my good friend and colleague, Mr. THOMPSON from Pennsylvania, for being such a strong partner on these issues.

COURT REPORTING AND CAPTIONING WEEK

(Mr. GUINTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUINTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the hundreds of court reporters and captioners in the Granite State and around the country as we prepare to celebrate National Court Reporting and Captioning Week next week.

Since the beginning of our Nation's history, beginning with the scribes during the Continental Congress and the drafting of our Declaration of Independence and Constitution, the act of transcribing events and important documents has always been a pillar of our democracy.

In fact, after their high school graduations, my own parents met at court reporting school and later went on to start their own court reporting business. Fifty years later, my mother still is in the business.

Court reporters are ever present right now in this very Chamber, in committee hearings, in capturing the spoken word and debate between Members of Congress, including Michele York, formerly of Candia, New Hampshire.

The court reporting and captioning industry continues to grow, estimating 5,000 new jobs over the next several

years. To the hundreds of court reporters and captioners in New Hampshire and around the country, thank you for all you do. And to the future reporters and captioners, thank you for continuing a legacy so paramount to our democracy and our country.

FUNDING FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, there are 16 calendar days and only 6 legislative days until the Department of Homeland Security shuts down on February 28. Let me repeat that. The Department charged with keeping America safe is set to run out of funding in just 2 weeks, all because the Republican majority insists on pandering to anti-immigrant extremists in their party. In fact, when asked if they were going to take up a new DHS funding bill, the Republican response was: Well, why do we have to?

Well, to my brazen colleagues across the aisle who refuse to govern, here is why: because keeping American families safe should be the first responsibility of this Congress. At a time of increased threats around the world, holding the country's national security hostage for the sake of a partisan stunt is the height of irresponsibility. Without funding, DHS would be unable to manage and support the homeland security infrastructure that was built following the 9/11 terrorist attacks to keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, this is not leadership. The American people deserve much better than this. We must continue funding the Department of Homeland Security immediately.

HONORING LOLIS EDWARD ELIE

(Mr. RICHMOND asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in honor of Lolis Edward Elie, one of the Nation's preeminent civil rights attorneys.

Elie, a native of New Orleans, attended Howard University, Dillard University, and later earned his J.D. from Loyola Law School. Following graduation, Elie started the law firm of Collins, Douglas, and Elie, which became the most noteworthy firm in Louisiana for racial equality.

In 1960, the New Orleans chapter of the Congress of Racial Equality, or CORE, asked Elie and his firm to represent them following a sit-in. Elie and his firm defended CORE chapter president Rudy Lombard and three others who were arrested for staging a sit-in protest at the lunch counter of the McCrory five-and-ten-cent store. They appealed the case to the United States Supreme Court, which, in its decision, declared the city's ban on sit-ins un-

constitutional. Later in his career, Elie was one of seven supporters of the Freedom Riders who met with Attorney General Robert Kennedy in 1961 when Kennedy encouraged them to shift their efforts to registering Black Southerners to vote.

His son, Lolis Eric Elie, is a prominent writer and filmmaker.

Lolis, Sr., still calls New Orleans home and mentors the younger generation through his training program for new Black attorneys. Through Lolis Elie's example, many young Black men and women are able to achieve much more than they ever thought possible, myself included.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 12, 2015 at 9:09 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 295.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 636, AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2015

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 101 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 101

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-5 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-6 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) 90 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. On Tuesday, the Committee on Rules met and reported a rule for consideration of two important pieces of tax legislation, H.R. 644 and H.R. 636.

The resolution provides a closed rule for consideration of each bill and provides for 90 minutes of debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means on each bill. In addition, the rule provides for a motion to recommit on each bill.

Mr. Speaker, most of my colleagues will remember the House's consideration of H.R. 5771, the Tax Increase Prevention Act of 2014, in December of last year. At that time, more than 50 individual tax extenders were retroactively extended for the 2014 tax year, giving businesses just 12 days to make complicated investment decisions. That is no way to run a business.

Every time I am at home I hear from Oklahomans who either work for or own small businesses. Without fail, they tell me that certainty is what they need most from Washington. But too often Washington tells Americans who operate and work in small businesses to "trust us." We promise to extend X or Y or Z tax provision indefinitely.

Unfortunately, those Americans can't take that to the bank. They can't

take our word that we will actually be able to deliver on the promises made by Congress. The only thing they can rely on is the law. If our tax laws expire every year, it injects an uncertainty into the business environment that inhibits economic growth.

Even though we were able to retroactively extend those tax provisions at the end of last year, they are already expired again. Instead of continuing this cycle of uncertainty, it is important to put these tax cuts in place early so that we don't end up in a situation like we did last year.

I applaud Chairman RYAN for beginning early with provisions we all agree on.

□ 1245

This rule will provide for consideration of permanent extension of seven different tax provisions, provisions like section 179 expensing and provisions like extending the deduction of IRA distributions to charities. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, have supported these measures in the past, at least on a temporary basis. These are tax provisions that we retroactively extended less than 2 months ago. Why shouldn't we make these popular tax provisions permanent and do it now, not retroactively late in the year?

Mr. Speaker, some have criticized this legislation because it "isn't paid for." I think Chairman RYAN said it best in the Rules Committee on Tuesday. These are provisions of the Tax Code which we routinely extend, year after year. They are effectively part of the existing Tax Code. Permanently reauthorizing them reflects the policy this country has maintained for years, under both Republican and Democratic administrations and Congress. And doing so provides business with the certainty that they desperately seek.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few moments to note that just as we have had to examine and pare back the discretionary side of the budget, we need to examine and pare back the tax side of the budget. There are over 200 tax expenditures—or spending on the "tax side" of the ledger—that, if all are extended, will cost the Federal Government more than \$12 trillion over the next 10 years. Many of these provisions are worthy, but many others should clearly be eliminated. The sheer complexity of the Tax Code and associated regulations should push us towards reforms so that our Tax Code works for us all in the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman RYAN for beginning this process in earnest and look forward to the consideration of additional measures at the appropriate time.

I urge support for the rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today we are considering two pieces of tax legislation under closed rules. These mark our 10th and 11th closed rules in the first 6 weeks of the 114th Congress. Sadly, this has become the standard operating procedure in the Republican House.

In 2011, when Republicans took the majority, Speaker BOEHNER promised "the right to a robust debate in open process." He promised many open rules. Instead, we have just ended the most closed Congress in history. And if these past 6 weeks are any indication of where we are headed, this leadership seems intent on breaking its own record for denying open debate on the House floor.

I also want to point out that the Department of Homeland Security runs out of money February 28, 16 days from now. Press reports indicate that the Republican leadership is scrambling to gather the votes necessary to pass a bill.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have some advice for my friends in the majority. Instead of yelling, instead of pouting and swearing, bring to the floor a clean Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill, the bipartisan negotiated compromise that has been ready to go since last November. This is a bill that could and should be sent to the President as quickly as possible, especially considering the international and national homeland security situation facing the U.S. and the world at this very, very moment.

So I have to say that I am a little perplexed as to why the majority has chosen this week to bring to the floor a package of tax breaks that are not paid for, that are going nowhere, 5 legislative days before the Department of Homeland Security is going to be forced to shut down because of Republican dithering.

And I say going nowhere because Senate Republicans have said quite clearly that these bills will not likely be considered in committee or by the full Senate. Let me repeat that. These bills are going nowhere because of the Republicans in the Senate. They have made it pretty clear.

So the clock is ticking on funding our Homeland Security programs, Mr. Speaker. Are the Republican leaders planning to let the clock run out, planning to create another crisis?

We should be debating a clean Department of Homeland Security bill right now. We ought to vote in a bipartisan way to pass it, have the Senate do the same thing, send it right to the President, and actually accomplish something.

I am also concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the partisan approach taken by the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee in advancing these particular tax measures. We went through this same exercise last year

with a similar set of bills, only to pass in the final weeks of the 113th Congress a 1-year comprehensive “tax extenders” package. The Republican leadership in the House is setting the stage for a similar confrontation this year, instead of working in a productive and bipartisan manner on comprehensive tax reform.

That is something that the American people, Democrats and Republicans, all want. They want us to be working on it, and they want us to pass a bipartisan comprehensive tax reform bill.

The seven tax provisions before us today, packaged into two bills, will add more than \$93 billion to the deficit. There was a time when my Republican friends actually cared about the deficit. I guess those days are gone.

While I support the goals of many of the provisions contained in these bills, I cannot vote for legislation that targets only a handful of tax provisions, chooses to elevate them and make them permanent at the expense of other tax priorities, and then refuses to pay for them—absolutely refuses to pay for them.

This Republican package does nothing, absolutely nothing to address key priorities, like the work opportunity tax credit and the new markets tax credit. It fails to address the long-term status of the child tax credit and the earned income tax credit that work to reduce poverty.

If these tax provisions are allowed to expire in 2017, as currently scheduled, many working poor families would lose their child tax credit, and many low-income married couples and larger families would see a cut in their EITC. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities estimates that if the EITC and the CTC provisions were to expire, “more than 16 million people in low-income working families, including 8 million children, would fall into—or deeper into—poverty.”

The piecemeal, deficit-spending approach taken by this majority puts these working family tax provisions at risk.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see members of the Republican leadership at D.C. Central Kitchen the other day talking about hunger. D.C. Central Kitchen does incredible work to feed the hungry and help people get back on their feet.

But count me as a little skeptical because time after time after time after time, Republicans have targeted poor people and the programs that help them.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle are serious about ending hunger, they need to do much more than encourage donations to food banks. First and foremost, they should stop targeting SNAP, the Nation’s premier antihunger program. They should stop treating SNAP as an ATM machine for other programs.

Instead, they should work with us to increase the minimum wage or at least give us a vote on increasing the min-

imum wage. They should work with us to expand job training programs and make child care more affordable. They should work with us to fix the major flaw in our social safety net; namely, that when someone gets a job that doesn’t pay very much, they tend to lose all their benefits and end up struggling, once again, to put food on the table, find day care for their kids, keep their house warm, and pay the rent.

We need desperately to have a serious and thoughtful discussion about the long-term sustainability of our safety net programs.

The Fighting Hunger Incentive Act makes permanent the enhanced deduction for contributions of food inventory. I strongly support our food banks and charitable organizations that work each and every day to feed the hungry in this country. I support efforts that provide incentives to donate food to these organizations. But one tax break does not constitute a plan to address hunger. And it certainly does not make up for the cuts to SNAP and other safety net programs that have been proposed and enacted by this Republican majority.

So in closing, again, I would urge my colleagues to pay attention to today’s National Journal Daily, the headline: “So Far, a Congress About Nothing.” That is what this Congress is becoming known as, “a Congress about nothing.”

Well, work with us in a bipartisan way to change this headline, and you could do that by allowing a clean Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill to come before us. We can pass it in a bipartisan way, and we can meet the national security needs of our country and actually do something before we go home on another break.

With that, I urge my colleagues to reject this rule and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My good friend from Massachusetts covered a lot of ground. I am not going to try to deal with every single issue that he raised in my response. But let me point out a couple of facts.

First, my friend is concerned about the deficit, and I appreciate that. But this is a rather new, novel idea for Democrats. When the Republican majority actually took power, the deficit was \$1.4 trillion a year. It is under \$500 billion, which is still way too high. But this majority has taken deficits extremely seriously and has lowered them every year.

Second, my friend is worried about the cost of these tax cuts. That is amazing to me because when they were in the majority, they routinely extended these same tax credits without paying for them year after year after year. So the sudden conversion to paying for tax cuts is new and remarkable and probably worth some consideration.

Third, my friend is worried about this coming to the floor under a closed

rule. Frankly, tax legislation always comes to the floor under a closed rule. It is pretty hard to make calculations otherwise. And that was true with Democrats. It is true with Republicans. In this particular case, I am informed that the minority was offered a chance to submit an alternative proposal in the form of an amendment and chose not to exercise that right. That is certainly their right. But if they wanted an alternative, it could have been made in order. They chose not to do that.

My friend raised the issue of Homeland Security. And on this, frankly, we all are concerned. I think all Americans are worried. I think where we disagree is, this House has acted. It has fully funded and passed, and we are waiting on the Senate to do something.

Now, what is happening in the Senate? My friend alluded to the fact that the Republicans were somehow responsible for this in the Senate. As he well knows, the Republicans on three occasions have tried to bring the bill that we passed in this Chamber to the floor for consideration. The Democratic majority on all three occasions have kept them from reaching the 60 votes that Senate rules require. Why? Because they simply don’t want to vote on anything.

We lived through 4 years of a Democratic majority that never brought appropriations bills to the floor. They have already had more votes under the Republican leadership in the other body in a matter of weeks than they had all of last year. The Democratic majority in the Senate didn’t want a vote. The Democratic minority in the Senate evidently does not want a vote either. And that has frustrated, frankly, both sides and has kept legislation from coming to be. That is just simply the reality of it.

We will wait to see what the Senate does. I would not expect them to pass exactly what we pass over here. If they would simply allow consideration for a bill, something would emerge. We would go to conference. We would hammer out our differences, and we could move on and fund the Department of Homeland Security.

But right now, this is a Senate issue. This is not a House issue. And this is a question as to whether or not Democratic Senators will allow their own body to function. That is in their hands, not in ours.

Frankly, I think that we will, unfortunately, see a lot of this in the course of this session. We will send legislation over. Democrats will try to keep it from being considered. I think they will be offered the opportunity to consider that legislation over and over again. I hope we don’t see this pattern repeated time after time after time.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, I urge my colleagues to read the National Journal Daily today and pay close attention to this headline,

"So Far, a Congress About Nothing." And that is basically what we are doing here today.

The tax provisions that we are talking about here today, the Republicans over in the Senate are saying that they don't intend to bring any of these before the relevant committees or bring them to the floor. They are trying to work on a more long-term comprehensive tax reform bill, as we should be here. So we can't blame the Democrats for that. It is the Republicans in the Senate who have said they aren't going to take this up.

So then the question arises, why are we doing this? Why aren't we doing something that is more urgent and more pressing, like passing a Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill?

And let's be clear about what the problem is. There is a bipartisan bill that Democrats and Republicans agree on on funding the Department of Homeland Security. What some of the more extreme elements in the House of Representatives on the Republican side have done is they have loaded it up with all kinds of anti-immigration provisions.

□ 1300

They have decided that that is where they want the debate on immigration, so all of a sudden, this bill has been loaded up with extraneous issues that don't belong on this bill. Quite frankly, we think that that is wrong, and Democrats in the Senate think it is wrong. What we are saying is actually bring before both bodies a clean bill.

What is so wrong with that? If you don't like what the President is doing on immigration, bring up a separate bill or sue him again because that seems to be what my Republican friends like to do all the time, but don't hold up a Department of Homeland Security bill for a political battle on an issue, quite frankly, that does not belong on an appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, again, there are only 16 days left until the funding of the Department of Homeland Security expires. It is 16 days, but 5 legislative days only. If it expires, it would shut down many of the crucial operations that keep our country safe.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule that will allow for consideration of a clean Department of Homeland Security funding bill. With such serious consequences, it is time to put politics aside in order to strengthen our homeland and protect American families.

To discuss our proposal, I will yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the distinguished ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge this House to immediately take up and pass the bipartisan negotiated clean funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

By defeating the previous question on the pending rule, we can immediately make in order the bipartisan, clean, negotiated Homeland Security bill and stop the theatrics over the President's use of executive orders.

My colleague Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and I made a similar attempt yesterday, which was unfortunately defeated on a party-line vote. It is my sincere hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle have further discussed this issue amongst themselves and that they are now prepared to end this standoff.

Mr. Speaker, as of today, we are 135 days into what should have been the start of the fiscal year. The situation this House has caused is completely unacceptable.

We simply cannot wait 1 day longer—1 more day—to do the right thing, the responsible thing, and fund these critical agencies tasked with protecting this Nation.

As the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, I was involved in bipartisan, bicameral negotiations on the omnibus spending bill that passed the House and the Senate and was signed by the President last December.

That package could have contained all 12 annual spending bills because all 12 were negotiated in conference and every one of them was ready to go. We thank Representative PRICE for his role in negotiating the Homeland Security bill last Congress.

But an unfortunate decision was made by the leadership of this body to omit the Homeland Security bill—not because there were outstanding issues or continued disputes. That bill was stripped from the omnibus because some in this body were upset by the President's executive order on immigration.

They even admitted the President's actions had little to do with the Homeland Security Appropriations bill, yet that was the choice that was made on how to proceed.

The Homeland Security Appropriations bill was forced to operate under a continuing resolution instead of having a full-year bill. Ironically, it meant the Customs and Border Protection and Immigration and Customs Enforcement—two of the agencies tasked with defending our borders and enforcing our immigration laws—had to do without the nearly \$1 billion increase they would have gotten under the full-year bill.

Delaying the full-year bill limits the Department's ability to advance the Secretary's unity of effort initiative designed to improve coordination in our security missions, limits the ability of the Secretary to move ahead with the Southern Border and Approaches Campaign, creates uncertainty regarding ICE's capacity to detain and deport dangerous criminals, complicates the Department's ability to deal with another influx of unaccompanied children at our border sta-

tions, delays implementation of the new security upgrades at the White House and hiring increases of the U.S. Secret Service, and delays terrorism preparedness and response grants for State and local public safety personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle feel quite strongly about the President's use of executive orders on immigration policy, but I am compelled to remind those colleagues that they have every tool at their disposal to pass legislation changing the President's proposal.

This stunt has gone on too long. It is time to admit these immigration policy decisions have little to nothing to do with the appropriations process. The Homeland Security bill should never have been held hostage in this fight.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I put a statement by Secretary of Homeland Security Jeh Johnson into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I thought it was so important for my colleagues to read.

In it, the Secretary laid out the consequences of operating under a continuing resolution and summed up the dangerous situation we face with a sobering message.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentlewoman an additional 1 minute.

Mrs. LOWEY. "Border security is not free."

I couldn't agree more.

Yesterday, as a result of the party-line vote in the House on bringing up a clean bill, many of my majority colleagues insisted it was the Senate's turn to act, but it is clear for all those watching that the Senate cannot pass a Homeland Security bill with the House's extraneous riders attached. Further, the President has made it abundantly clear he would veto the bill if these riders remained.

I ask my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: What now? Hasn't this gone on long enough? Isn't it time we abandon the failed strategy and pass a clean bill funding the Homeland Security Department?

To that end, I urge this whole House to join me today in defeating the previous question so that my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN can offer an amendment to provide a clean, full-year appropriations bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me return the focus for a moment at least to the matter at hand, the legislation in front of us.

In response to my good friend from Massachusetts' concerns, remember, the provisions in the tax legislation that we are considering have been routinely enacted for years under both Democratic and Republican Congresses and Democratic and Republican administrations.

They are so automatic that they are essentially part of the existing Tax

Code. Frankly, I predict once we get to the legislation, probably we will have dozens of my friend's colleagues vote in favor of these. That certainly was the case last year when similar provisions were brought to the floor. There will be a lot of Democratic votes for the very bills that are under consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with my friend. We do need a larger overhaul of the entire tax system. He is totally correct at that. We made some progress in that regard last year. I have no doubt that is exactly Mr. RYAN's intent.

The reason to act on these measures and others like them now that will be part of any final package is to simply give our fellow Americans—businesses, workers, and people that want to make charitable contributions—tax certainty early in the year, so they can go ahead and make their actions knowing that this legislation is in place.

I am not convinced that none of these will be taken up by the other side in the other Chamber. We will see. It is an unpredictable body, but we will see.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment my friend from New York, the gentlewoman who is the ranking member on Appropriations. We have gotten 95 percent or so of government funded in large part due to her efforts in conjunction with our colleague, the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, and she was a big reason that that got done and got done in a bipartisan manner.

We passed legislation across this floor with the gentlelady's help, quite frankly. So all of us, myself included, owe you a debt in that regard.

I do point out that the legislation on homeland—we have acted on that. Now, my friends have said, Well, perhaps you should sue the President. That is a good suggestion. About 30-odd States are doing that right now.

He is in court because the action he took, in their view, is going to cost them millions and millions of dollars. My personal view is perhaps the House should somehow associate itself with that lawsuit. That is not my decision to make, but I think that is an appropriate thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, this was an action that was extraordinarily provocative by the President. The President has a long history of using immigration as a political issue rather than viewing it as a problem to be solved.

When he ran for office in 2008, he said he would have an immigration bill on the floor within 100 days. We had a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, and we never saw the bill.

Then we didn't hear much about it for 2 years because he was busy running for his own reelection. Then later, we heard a lot about it. The President said he was going to act before the election. Then he pulled back from doing that because he thought, Well, electorally, this may not be advantageous.

But the minute afterwards when he thought it was to his political advantage, he rolled it out again. So let's be

real here about how serious this effort is, but it will be challenged in court.

In terms of this body, again, it has passed appropriate legislation on funding. It has done exactly as my friend from New York suggests, use some of the tools that are legitimately at its disposal. That bill now rests in the Senate.

If the Democratic minority in the Senate will allow it to be brought up, I would not expect it would come back exactly as this House fashioned it. They simply just need to do their job, send something back, go to conference, and we can act on it. They have had lots of time to do this. This was moved over there weeks ago—or a couple of weeks ago.

The real problem here, Mr. Speaker, is the United States Senate, because of the obstruction of the minority, is simply choosing not to act. As soon as they act, I think we will probably move pretty expeditiously, find some common ground, and address my friend's concerns because I think they are very legitimate concerns and very appropriate in terms of getting the Homeland Security bill done.

It is a good bill. The underlying bill that my friend was part of negotiating was an excellent piece of bipartisan, bicameral compromise. If the Senate would simply take up the bill in front of them, I think we could get to the point we could have an agreement in rather short order.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue to hope that the Senate actually does its job.

In the meantime, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to respond to a few of the points that the gentleman has made in his speech on the floor here.

First of all, about the process—these are closed rules that we are dealing with here today. Yes, while it has been traditional to give tax provisions closed rules, there were Members who actually brought amendments to the House Rules Committee to help pay for some of these that I think might have been able to earn bipartisan support because I think there are some Members on your side of the aisle who would like these paid for and do not want to add to the deficit, but they were not made in order in the Rules Committee.

There may be other ideas on how to pay for this so we can truly have a bipartisan vote on this and not add to the deficit, but we will not have that opportunity because of the rule.

Again, Mr. Speaker, these provisions that we are talking about would add \$93 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years. Yes, maybe Republicans and Democrats in the past have extended these without pay-fors, but that doesn't make it right. It just means we both added to the deficit. Maybe we ought to get serious about Pay-As-You-Go.

My friends on the other side of the aisle insist that emergency unemploy-

ment benefits have to be paid for, but when it comes to any kind of tax cut, they don't believe anything has to be paid for, so we should have a more open process on this.

My friend talks about certainty, that all we are trying to do is give people certainty, but that is not the case. It is not the case because the President has said that he would threaten to veto these bills if they weren't paid for. It is what Republican leaders in the Senate have said.

ROY BLUNT, our former colleague in the House, made it very clear. He said:

As long as the Finance Committee in the Senate feels there is an opportunity for overall tax reform, I think you are going to not see a quick response to individual bills coming over here. We may deal with them later on down the aisle, but there is no sense that the Senate is going to act on this any time soon.

When we talk about providing people certainty, that is not what we are doing here. This is about just kind of going through the motions for the sake of going through the motions.

Finally, on the Department of Homeland Security bill, yes, the House acted and attached all these radical anti-immigrant riders to the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill.

MITCH MCCONNELL, the Senate majority leader, told reporters on Tuesday:

I think it is clear we cannot go forward in the Senate, so the next move, obviously, is up to the House.

□ 1315

Today is Thursday. Tomorrow we leave for a break, and it doesn't seem like Republican leaders feel the same sense of urgency that we do over here that we need to get this business completed.

Republicans are obviously refusing to admit the reality of this kind of dangerous anti-immigrant grandstanding. In fact, when reporters asked House Majority Leader KEVIN MCCARTHY whether the House would take up a new DHS funding bill, he said, "Why do we have to?"

Let me respond to the majority leader. The reason why we have to is because our primary job here is to protect the people of the United States of America. By letting this bill lapse, we are failing in our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD).

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I, too, rise to urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question on the rule so it can be amended to make in order House consideration of H.R. 861, the clean, bipartisan Homeland Security Appropriations Act for fiscal year 2015.

As we have been reminded by previous speakers, today is February 12, 135 days into fiscal year 2015, and there are only 16 days remaining until the current CR expires. Of these days, the House is scheduled to be in session only 5. If some of my colleagues have a sense of *deja vu* when they hear that, I

can sympathize. I get the same feeling when I wake up each morning and find that Congress is still spinning its wheels on a full-year funding bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

I know some of my colleagues believe the onus to act now lies with the Senate, as we have heard. I agree, the Senate should act. While it has had multiple failed attempts to bring up the House bill containing the poison pill riders, the Senate Republican leadership has not tried to bring up the clean, bipartisan funding bill.

I feel confident that a majority of the Senate would support the bill without the poison pill riders added to the House on the floor. There is only one way to find out.

The real question is why isn't the House Republican leadership willing to bring the clean Homeland Security bill for a vote? Why wait? Why not take the initiative and make H.R. 861 in order today? We can quickly resolve the funding dilemma facing the Department of Homeland Security, and the House could then work its will on immigration policy and border security by debating the legislation reported to the House by the authorizing committees. That is the way our process was intended to work by our framers.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, the clean full-year DHS funding bill was negotiated in good faith on a bicameral, bipartisan basis, and it addresses the most pressing needs of the Department to protect this country from harm. The President would sign that bill today, and we should send it to him.

I urge my colleagues to put the safety of our country first and defeat the previous question to make in order the consideration of H.R. 861, the clean Homeland Security funding bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Again, let's go back over a couple of points in the process where my friends and I disagree.

Again, tax legislation normally comes here under a closed rule—almost always. Democrats do it; Republicans do it.

The second point: I bet you that these provisions that we are discussing here today will at some point this year, if not in this legislation, almost certainly—as a matter of fact, certainly—be extended and placed. All we are trying to do is move them early so people know for sure it is going to happen and can plan and act accordingly—and, frankly, dozens of my friends who will vote for this, almost certainly, when it is actually considered on the floor. Nothing unusual or extreme here. It is just simply a way to try to give a break and a little advance notice to hardworking men and women that run small businesses all over America.

On the Homeland Security issue, again, this is now in the Senate. This body has acted. The Senate can literally do whatever it chooses to do. We have had several suggestions of what Republican leaders can do or what Democratic leaders can do.

Right now, the Democratic minority has chosen not to allow debate to occur, not to act on the bill. If they simply act on the bill, I suspect it will change. It will not look exactly like what we sent over. All they need to do is actually legislate.

Now, this is the oldest book, evidently, in the minority party on the other body's playbook, because, again, they did it when they were in the majority. They just simply refuse to vote on things. We don't have a broken House. We certainly have differences of opinion in the House, but at least we act and actually move legislation across the floor and put it in the other Chamber.

All we are asking of Democrats and Republicans alike in the other Chamber is just do your job. Just send us something. We will go to conference with you. We will hammer out a compromise, and we will go on from there.

So this sort of *deja vu* all over again, I agree with that. We saw a Democratic majority in the Senate blocking action on almost any legislation, didn't pass a single appropriations bill last year. We now see a Democratic minority trying to do, in the same body, essentially the same thing.

So, hopefully, that lesson will be learned at some point over there and they will just simply pick up legislation and begin to move it. If they do, I think we can find a lot of common ground on a lot of important issues.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remaining time.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I am going to urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question. If we defeat the previous question, I will bring up an amendment that will allow for there to be a clean vote on the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. No controversial anti-immigrant riders, just the bill that a bipartisan group of Members and the Appropriations Committees agreed on in an up or down vote.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, while I have great respect for my friend on the Rules Committee, and I sometimes get frustrated by the Senate as well, the fact of the matter is, at least in the Senate, they are voting on a lot more amendments than we are in the House. We don't have an open process here. We have one of the most closed processes, if not the most closed process, in history. That is where a lot of the frustration comes from.

On these tax provisions, I think there is broad bipartisan support on the policy. I support, I think, mostly all of

them. If we worked in a bipartisan way to make sure they were paid for, I think you would get a unanimous vote here in the House.

But for some reason, this notion of working in a bipartisan way is something that my friends on the other side of the aisle just refuse to do. It is their way or the highway. It is one political message vote after another, after another, after another. I think people are getting sick of it.

I go back to the headline in the National Journal Daily: "So Far, a Congress About Nothing." The reason why it is about nothing is that this Chamber is not working.

There is no bipartisanship here when it comes to legislation; there is no give and take. Routinely, we are being forced to vote up or down on bills that, quite frankly, with a few tweaks and some improvements, would pass. And the bills that we are talking about here I think would pass overwhelmingly if we just open up the process a little bit, a little give-and-take.

Let's also be clear, we are not providing anybody with any certainty about anything. The Senate leaders of the relevant committees that would take up this tax legislation have said clearly they are not going to take it up, not any time soon. So it is not urgent that we be debating and doing these bills here today. What is urgent is the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill.

For the life of me, I don't understand why the Republican leadership can't override the views of a handful of extremists in their party who are insisting on maintaining these anti-immigration riders, holding the Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill hostage, and thereby jeopardizing the security of the people of the United States of America.

We have 5 legislative days left to deal with this, and we are leaving tomorrow for a break. Again, we go home and tell our constituents when they ask, "What have you accomplished?" the answer is, "Nothing."

We have done nothing. Yes, we have had debates, we have had votes, but on things that are going nowhere. Not only because the President has threatened vetoes on most of the legislation, but because the House Republicans are saying: The stuff you are sending over to us is too extreme.

What have we done? We voted to repeal the Affordable Care Act for the 57th or the 58th time, another waste of taxpayer money going nowhere. We voted on the Keystone bill twice, closed rules, and voted on a bill to basically deny women essential reproductive rights that was so over the top and so extreme that the Republican leadership had to pull it and substitute it with something else.

So that has been the total amount of work that has been done here. I don't know how my Republican friends go home and brag about, or even talk about, what we have been doing here when it has amounted to nothing.

Let's do something. Let's defeat the previous question. Allow me to bring up an amendment that would allow for a clean vote on a Department of Homeland Security appropriations bill. We can come together in a bipartisan way, pass it overwhelmingly in the House, pass it overwhelmingly in the Senate. You will all be invited down to the White House when the President signs it into law. We all can agree on it and show our constituents, Democrats and Republicans alike, that we can work together and we can get something done, that we are not a Congress just about nothing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, let's go back to the beginning of this debate and make sure that folks are very clear about what we are talking about. We are talking about extending tax breaks that have routinely been extended for years—that Democrats have extended, that Republicans have extended—that, frankly, have not been paid for in the past, and that will most certainly be part of any overall package that is enacted.

We are simply saying let's make sure people that have a benefit bestowed in these areas know and can calculate and make business decisions accordingly early in the year instead of scramble at the very end. It simply makes sense, and it is simply fair to the American taxpayer. That is important to remember.

Also, it is important to remember that the underlying legislation is extremely bipartisan. The only part of this process that will be partisan is the normal procedural part, where it is almost a sort of shirts and skins game where Democrats all vote against a Republican rule—we do exactly the same thing when we are in the minority—and our people mostly vote for that rule, and I think probably certainly will today; and then we will actually have a vote on the underlying legislation, and many, many, many Democrats will join almost all Republicans and vote for it.

So we think it is a good piece of legislation, and we also think it is part of an incremental effort. We think Mr. RYAN will bring other bills like this to the floor but also will, in time, make an overall proposal on tax reform. Then we will see if our friends are really serious about engaging in that debate. I am not questioning my friends on this side of the aisle, but I do have some serious questions about how serious the President is about tax reform. But, again, we will see.

Finally, we have had a great deal of discussion about Homeland Security. And, again, just to be clear, this House has acted and fully funded Homeland Security. The Homeland is done. It is funded through the end of this month. We have got legislation that we have agreed on.

The President, in my view, provoked a crisis by acting unilaterally. That view, by the way, is not just a narrow view by a few people. He is in court defending his actions. Over 30 States are involved in a lawsuit against him because of what he did. He knew it was going to be controversial. He waited until after the elections to try and pick a fight and I think probably try to cover up a little bit for how poorly his side did in that particular election, anything to change the topic.

□ 1330

So now we are here.

The House has reacted to that, I think, in an appropriate form and has sent it to the Senate. In the Senate, the Democratic minority has simply refused to allow any debate. They can do that under the Senate rules—and I respect that process—but let's be clear about who is stopping the funding of Homeland Security. It is actually Democratic Senators, who won't allow a measure to even come up for debate.

Now, if that measure came up for debate, what this House passed, I would suspect that it would be changed in some ways. I do not expect the Senate will do exactly what we suggest and think they should do. They very seldom do that. If they will just do that, we will arrive at, I think, a common agreement; we will go to conference; there will be the normal give-and-take in politics; and we will reach an agreement.

My friend is concerned about the openness of the process. Again, I point out that, when we deal with this kind of legislation, it is normally a closed rule, and this has been pretty routine stuff. I commit to my friend on this point: we will actually be much more open in the appropriations process than my friends were when they were in the majority. They almost never brought bills to the floor, and when they did, they actually, for the first time, brought them under closed rules. We will bring our bills to the floor under open rules, and that is normal in the appropriations process. I think, if you actually look at the record of the two majorities side by side, you will find that there were a lot more amendments made available to Members of both sides under a Republican majority than has been the case when my friends were most recently in power.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, again, I want to point out that the legislation in question is routine, and it should be enacted on a bipartisan basis. We have the potential, if the Senate will act, to actually put it on the President's desk. I don't think he would actually veto it if we did, but, again, that would be his call.

I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 101 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN OF MASSACHUSETTS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 861) making appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2015, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 861.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution. . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend

the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the 7 Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of New York) at 2 p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 644, FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 636, AMERICA'S SMALL BUSINESS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 2015

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution

(H. Res. 101) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 636) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend increased expensing limitations, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 232, nays 164, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—232

Aderholt	Franks (AZ)	Massie
Allen	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Amash	Garrett	McCaul
Amodei	Gibbs	McClintock
Babin	Gohmert	McHenry
Barletta	Goodlatte	McKinley
Barr	Gosar	McMorris
Barton	Gowdy	Rodgers
Benishek	Granger	McSally
Billirakis	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Meehan
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Messer
Black	Griffith	Mica
Blackburn	Grothman	Miller (MI)
Blum	Guinta	Moolenaar
Bost	Guthrie	Mooney (WV)
Boustany	Hanna	Mullin
Brady (TX)	Hardy	Mulvaney
Brat	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Bridenstine	Harris	Neugebauer
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Newhouse
Brooks (IN)	Heck (NV)	Noem
Buchanan	Hensarling	Nugent
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Bucshon	Hice (GA)	Olson
Burgess	Hill	Palazzo
Byrne	Holding	Palmer
Calvert	Hudson	Perry
Carter (GA)	Huizenga (MI)	Pittenger
Carter (TX)	Hultgren	Pitts
Chabot	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Chaffetz	Hurd (TX)	Poliquin
Clawson (FL)	Hurt (VA)	Pompeo
Coffman	Issa	Posey
Cole	Jenkins (KS)	Price (GA)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (WV)	Ratcliffe
Collins (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Reed
Comstock	Johnson, Sam	Reichert
Conaway	Jolly	Renacci
Cook	Jones	Ribble
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Rice (SC)
Crawford	Joyce	Rigell
Crenshaw	Katko	Roby
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (AL)
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rogers (KY)
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Rohrabacher
Denham	Kinzinger (IL)	Rokita
Dent	Kline	Rooney (FL)
DeSantis	Knight	Ros-Lehtinen
DesJarlais	Labrador	Roskam
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Ross
Dold	Lamborn	Rothfus
Duffy	Lance	Rouzer
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Royce
Duncan (TN)	LoBiondo	Russell
Ellmers	Long	Ryan (WI)
Emmer	Loudermilk	Salmon
Farenthold	Love	Sanford
Fincher	Lucas	Scalise
Fleischmann	Luetkemeyer	Schock
Fleming	Lummis	Schweikert
Flores	MacArthur	Scott, Austin
Forbes	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Fox	Marino	Sessions

Shimkus	Tipton	Whitfield
Shuster	Trott	Williams
Simpson	Turner	Wilson (SC)
Smith (MO)	Upton	Wittman
Smith (NE)	Valadao	Womack
Smith (NJ)	Wagner	Woodall
Smith (TX)	Walberg	Yoder
Stefanik	Walden	Yoho
Stewart	Walker	Young (AK)
Stivers	Weber (TX)	Young (IA)
Stutzman	Webster (FL)	Young (IN)
Thompson (PA)	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Thornberry	Westerman	Zinke
Tiberi	Westmoreland	

NAYS—164

Adams	Gabbard	Murphy (FL)
Aguilar	Gallego	Nadler
Ashford	Graham	Napolitano
Bass	Grayson	Neal
Beatty	Green, Al	Nolan
Becerra	Green, Gene	Norcross
Bera	Grijalva	Pallone
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Pascarell
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Payne
Blumenauer	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Peterson
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Himes	Pocan
Butterfield	Honda	Polis
Capps	Hoyer	Quigley
Capuano	Huffman	Rangel
Cárdenas	Israel	Rice (NY)
Carney	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Chu (CA)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	T.
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clay	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Cleaver	Kind	Schiff
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cohen	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Connolly	Langevin	Scott, David
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Costa	Lawrence	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sires
Cuellar	Levin	Slaughter
Cummings	Lewis	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu (CA)	Speier
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Takai
DeFazio	Loebuck	Takano
DeGette	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Delaney	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray	Tonko
DelBene	(NM)	Torres
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Tsongas
Deutch	Maloney,	Van Hollen
Dingell	Carolyn	Vargas
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	Matsui	Vela
Edwards	McCollum	Velázquez
Ellison	McDermott	Visclosky
Engel	McGovern	Wasserman
Farr	McNerney	Schultz
Fattah	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Foster	Meng	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moulton	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—36

Abraham	Gibson	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Roe (TN)
Brownley (CA)	Huelskamp	Ruiz
Bustos	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Loftgren	Sinema
Courtney	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Cramer	(NM)	Titus
Duckworth	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Eshoo	O'Rourke	Walters, Mimi
Esty	Paulsen	Walz
Fitzpatrick	Pearce	Welch
Fortenberry	Pelosi	
Garamendi	Peters	

□ 1428

Mr. POCAN changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. FARENTHOLD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 77, I was attending the Clay Hunt SAV bill signing at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 163, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

AYES—233

Aderholt	Graves (GA)	Murphy (FL)
Allen	Graves (LA)	Murphy (PA)
Amash	Graves (MO)	Neugebauer
Amodei	Griffith	Newhouse
Babin	Grothman	Noem
Barletta	Guinta	Nugent
Barr	Guthrie	Nunes
Barton	Hanna	Olson
Benishek	Hardy	Palazzo
Bilirakis	Harper	Palmer
Bishop (MI)	Harris	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Pittenger
Black	Heck (NV)	Pitts
Blackburn	Hensarling	Poe (TX)
Blum	Herrera Beutler	Poliquin
Bost	Hice (GA)	Pompeo
Boustany	Hill	Posey
Brady (TX)	Holding	Price (GA)
Brat	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Bridenstine	Huelskamp	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Renacci
Buchanan	Hurd (TX)	Ribble
Buck	Hurt (VA)	Rice (SC)
Bucshon	Issa	Rigell
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Calvert	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Carter (TX)	Jolly	Rokita
Chabot	Jones	Rooney (FL)
Chaffetz	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Clawson (FL)	Joyce	Roskam
Coffman	Katko	Ross
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Rouzer
Collins (NY)	King (NY)	Royce
Comstock	Kinzinger (IL)	Russell
Conaway	Kline	Ryan (WI)
Cook	Knight	Salmon
Costello (PA)	Labrador	Sanford
Crowley	LaMalfa	Scalise
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Schock
Culberson	Lance	Schweikert
Curbelo (FL)	Latta	Scott, Austin
Davis, Rodney	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Denham	Long	Sessions
Dent	Loudermilk	Shimkus
DeSantis	Love	Shuster
DesJarlais	Lucas	Simpson
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Dold	Lummis	Smith (NE)
Duffy	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Stefanik
Ellmers	Massie	Stewart
Emmer	McCarthy	Stivers
Farenthold	McCaul	Stutzman
Fincher	McClintock	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Thornberry
Fleming	McKinley	Tiberi
Flores	McMorris	Tipton
Forbes	Rodgers	Trott
Fox	McSally	Turner
Franks (AZ)	Meadows	Upton
Frelinghuysen	Meehan	Valadao
Garrett	Messer	Wagner
Gibbs	Mica	Walberg
Gohmert	Miller (MI)	Walden
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Walker
Gosar	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Gowdy	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Granger	Mulvaney	Wenstrup

Westerman
Westmoreland
Whitfield
Williams
Wilson (SC)

Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Young (IN)
Zeldin
Zinke

NOES—163

Adams	Gabbard	Nadler
Aguilar	Gallego	Napolitano
Ashford	Graham	Neal
Bass	Grayson	Nolan
Beatty	Green, Al	Norcross
Becerra	Green, Gene	Pallone
Bera	Grijalva	Pascarell
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hahn	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Hastings	Peterson
Bonamici	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Boyle (PA)	Higgins	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Butterfield	Honda	Quigley
Capps	Hoyer	Rangel
Capuano	Huffman	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Rush
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda T.
Chu (CA)	Keating	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kildee	Schiff
Clay	Kilmer	Schrader
Cleaver	Kind	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Kirkpatrick	Scott, David
Cohen	Kuster	Serrano
Connolly	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sherman
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sires
Costa	Lawrence	Slaughter
Crowley	Lee	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Levin	Speier
Cummings	Lewis	Takai
Davis (CA)	Lieu (CA)	Takano
Davis, Danny	Lipinski	Thompson (CA)
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Thompson (MS)
DeGette	Lowenthal	Tonko
Delaney	Lowe	Torres
DeLauro	Luján, Ben Ray	Tsongas
DeBene	(NM)	Van Hollen
DeSaulnier	Lynch	Vargas
Deutch	Maloney,	Veasey
Dingell	Carolyn	Vela
Doggett	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Doyle (PA)	Matsui	Visclosky
Edwards	McCollum	Wasserman
Ellison	McDermott	Schultz
Engel	McGovern	Waters, Maxine
Farr	McNerney	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meeks	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Meng	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Moore	
Fudge	Moulton	

NOT VOTING—36

Abraham	Gibson	Price (NC)
Brown (FL)	Hinojosa	Roe (TN)
Brownley (CA)	Huelskamp	Ruiz
Bustos	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cartwright	Lofgren	Sinema
Courtney	Lujan Grisham	Swalwell (CA)
Cramer	(NM)	Titus
Duckworth	Miller (FL)	Walorski
Eshoo	O'Rourke	Walters, Mimi
Esty	Paulsen	Walz
Fitzpatrick	Pearce	Welch
Fortenberry	Pelosi	
Garamendi	Peters	

□ 1438

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 78 I was attending the Clay Hunt SAV bill signing at the White House. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. BUSTOS. Mr. Speaker, on the Legislative Day of February 12, 2015, a series of votes was held. Had I been present for these rollcall votes, I would have cast the following

votes: rollcall 77—I vote "nay," rollcall 78—I vote "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to attending the President's Bill Signing Ceremony of the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention for American Veterans Act, I missed the following rollcall votes: No. 77 and No. 78 on February 12, 2015. If present, I would have voted: rollcall No. 77—On Ordering the Previous Question, "aye," rollcall vote No. 78—H. Res. 101—The rule providing for consideration of both H.R. 644—Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2015, and H.R. 636—America's Small Business Tax Relief Act of 2015, "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, on February 12, 2015, I missed two votes because I had the honor to be at the White House for the bill signing ceremony of H.R. 203, the Clay Hunt SAV Act. I missed recorded votes No. 77–78. I would like the record to reflect how I would have voted if I were present. On rollcall No. 77, I would have voted "yea," on rollcall No. 78, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, today, February 12, 2015, I was not present for call votes number 77 and 78 due to attendance at the White House bill signing ceremony for the Clay Hunt SAV Act. If I had been in attendance, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote 77 and "yea" on rollcall vote 78.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 77 and 78 I missed the votes to attend the signing of the Clay Hunt SAV Act into law, a bipartisan law that will reduce veteran suicides. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on 77 and "yea" on 78.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
The Speaker, U.S. Capitol,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on February 12, 2015 at 1:42 p.m.:

Appointments:
Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China.
National Council on the Arts.

United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control.
Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe (Helsinki).

Board of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

President's Export Council.
United States Holocaust Memorial Council.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

FIGHTING HUNGER INCENTIVE ACT OF 2015

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 101, I

call up the bill (H.R. 644) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend and expand the charitable deduction for contributions of food inventory, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 101, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 114-5 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 644

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “America Gives More Act of 2015”.

SEC. 2. EXTENSION AND EXPANSION OF CHARITABLE DEDUCTION FOR CONTRIBUTIONS OF FOOD INVENTORY.

(a) **PERMANENT EXTENSION.**—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking clause (iv).

(b) **INCREASE IN LIMITATION.**—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsection (a), is amended by striking clause (ii), by redesignating clause (iii) as clause (iv), and by inserting after clause (i) the following new clauses:

“(ii) **LIMITATION.**—The aggregate amount of such contributions for any taxable year which may be taken into account under this section shall not exceed—

“(I) in the case of any taxpayer other than a C corporation, 15 percent of the taxpayer’s aggregate net income for such taxable year from all trades or businesses from which such contributions were made for such year, computed without regard to this section, and

“(II) in the case of a C corporation, 15 percent of taxable income (as defined in subsection (b)(2)(D)).

“(iii) **RULES RELATED TO LIMITATION.**—

“(I) **CARRYOVER.**—If such aggregate amount exceeds the limitation imposed under clause (ii), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)) as a charitable contribution described in clause (i) in each of the 5 succeeding taxable years in order of time.

“(II) **COORDINATION WITH OVERALL CORPORATE LIMITATION.**—In the case of any charitable contribution allowable under clause (ii)(II), subsection (b)(2)(A) shall not apply to such contribution, but the limitation imposed by such subsection shall be reduced (but not below zero) by the aggregate amount of such contributions. For purposes of subsection (b)(2)(B), such contributions shall be treated as allowable under subsection (b)(2)(A).”

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.**—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as amended by subsections (a) and (b), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(v) **DETERMINATION OF BASIS FOR CERTAIN TAXPAYERS.**—If a taxpayer—

“(I) does not account for inventories under section 471, and

“(II) is not required to capitalize indirect costs under section 263A,

the taxpayer may elect, solely for purposes of subparagraph (B), to treat the basis of any apparently wholesome food as being equal to 25 percent of the fair market value of such food.”

(d) **DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—Section 170(e)(3)(C) of such Code, as

amended by subsections (a), (b), and (c), is amended by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(vi) **DETERMINATION OF FAIR MARKET VALUE.**—In the case of any such contribution of apparently wholesome food which cannot or will not be sold solely by reason of internal standards of the taxpayer, lack of market, or similar circumstances, or by reason of being produced by the taxpayer exclusively for the purposes of transferring the food to an organization described in subparagraph (A), the fair market value of such contribution shall be determined—

“(I) without regard to such internal standards, such lack of market, such circumstances, or such exclusive purpose, and

“(II) by taking into account the price at which the same or substantially the same food items (as to both type and quality) are sold by the taxpayer at the time of the contribution (or, if not so sold at such time, in the recent past).”

(e) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, the amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made after the date of the enactment of this Act, in taxable years ending after such date.

(2) **LIMITATION; APPLICABILITY TO C CORPORATIONS.**—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall apply to contributions made in taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. RULE ALLOWING CERTAIN TAX-FREE DISTRIBUTIONS FROM INDIVIDUAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS FOR CHARITABLE PURPOSES MADE PERMANENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 408(d)(8) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking subparagraph (F).

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply to distributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 4. SPECIAL RULE FOR QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS MADE PERMANENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) **INDIVIDUALS.**—Subparagraph (E) of section 170(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to contributions of qualified conservation contributions) is amended by striking clause (vi).

(2) **CORPORATIONS.**—Subparagraph (B) of section 170(b)(2) of such Code (relating to qualified conservation contributions) is amended by striking clause (iii).

(b) **CONTRIBUTIONS OF CAPITAL GAIN REAL PROPERTY MADE FOR CONSERVATION PURPOSES BY NATIVE CORPORATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 170(b)(2) of such Code is amended by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (D), and by inserting after subparagraph (B) the following new subparagraph:

“(C) **QUALIFIED CONSERVATION CONTRIBUTIONS BY CERTAIN NATIVE CORPORATIONS.**—

“(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Any qualified conservation contribution (as defined in subsection (h)(1)) which—

“(I) is made by a Native Corporation, and

“(II) is a contribution of property which was land conveyed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act,

shall be allowed to the extent that the aggregate amount of such contributions does not exceed the excess of the taxpayer’s taxable income over the amount of charitable contributions allowable under subparagraph (A).

“(ii) **CARRYOVER.**—If the aggregate amount of contributions described in clause (i) exceeds the limitation of clause (i), such excess shall be treated (in a manner consistent with the rules of subsection (d)(2)) as a charitable contribution to which clause (i) applies in each of the 15 succeeding taxable years in order of time.

“(iii) **NATIVE CORPORATION.**—For purposes of this subparagraph, the term ‘Native Corpora-

tion’ has the meaning given such term by section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act.”

(2) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(A) Section 170(b)(2)(A) of such Code is amended by striking “subparagraph (B) applies” and inserting “subparagraph (B) or (C) applies”.

(B) Section 170(b)(2)(B)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking “15 succeeding years” and inserting “15 succeeding taxable years”.

(3) **VALID EXISTING RIGHTS PRESERVED.**—Nothing in this subsection (or any amendment made by this subsection) shall be construed to modify the existing property rights validly conveyed to Native Corporations (within the meaning of section 3(m) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act) under such Act.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to contributions made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 2014.

SEC. 5. MODIFICATION OF THE TAX RATE FOR THE EXCISE TAX ON INVESTMENT INCOME OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4940(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “2 percent” and inserting “1 percent”.

(b) **ELIMINATION OF REDUCED TAX WHERE FOUNDATION MEETS CERTAIN DISTRIBUTION REQUIREMENTS.**—Section 4940 of such Code is amended by striking subsection (e).

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 6. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 90 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) each will control 45 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 644, the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Here is what we are trying to accomplish with this legislation today: we are trying to provide some more certainty.

Small businesses, they have to be able to plan for the future. Charities who are serving those in need, they also have to plan for the future. Families need to know whether there is going to be help for them at the local food bank. A lot of them look to the Tax Code, ironically, when planning for the future. They need a tax code that is easy to understand. But that is not the Tax Code that we have today. Whether we make the Tax Code more complicated—well, if we do that, we are

making their lives more unpredictable. That is a disservice to the people we are trying to serve.

What would really help would be to fix our broken tax system. And ultimately, our goal is to get to a tax code that is simpler, that is flatter, that is fairer for everybody. But we have still got work to do on that front, and life doesn't wait for Washington. In fact, Washington has a really bad habit of letting really important provisions expire, only to renew them retroactively. This has got to stop, and we are trying to fix this.

So this bill would make several of these provisions permanent. Number one, it would encourage charitable giving. Number two, it would help people contribute to charities from their IRAs, Individual Retirement Accounts, tax-free. Number three, it would let people deduct food bank donations from their taxes, and it would make other changes that make giving less expensive.

The quick to the short, Mr. Speaker, is these are provisions in the Code that we know—because it has been demonstrated—make a big difference.

□ 1445

It is so important that we have a vibrant civil society, that space that stands between ourselves and our government, which is where we live and we lead our lives, that it is vibrant and that that space is there to help people in need. Private charity is the glue that keeps our communities together.

In so many instances, private charities thrive on the good will and the donations and the generosity of other people, of businesses, and those businesses are affected by the Tax Code. What we have to do is provide certainty to those businesses who want to be generous and to those people who want to be generous, but to these charities who need some predictability, so they can plan their charitable endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, knowing that this is a bipartisan notion, knowing that the good work that is done by these groups is absolutely essential to healing people in our communities, to getting people on to lives of self-sufficiency, getting them to where they want to be in life, the least we can do is provide some certainty so more of this can happen.

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we waited until the end of the year to extend these provisions retroactive to the first of the year but only for that year—oh, and by the way, last year, we waited until December 11 to tell all of these charities, these donors to charities, Okay. Now, here is the benefit for the past year, but guess what, it already expired the beginning of this year.

I know that it sounds kind of complicated. The point is this is no way to run a railroad. We need to provide families with certainty. We need to provide charities with certainty. That is what this bill does.

The part that we are going to have a debate here, Mr. Speaker, is nobody

seems to have a problem when we do this 1 year at a time. Nobody seems to have a problem suggesting that we “pay for it” which is, in my opinion, another way of saying raise taxes on other people just to keep them the same when we do it 1 year at a time, but when we say, Let's make this thing permanent, this thing that we do once every year that everybody is fine with, instead of doing it once every year and sometimes retroactively, let's just do it permanently so people in families and businesses can plan, then all of a sudden, there is a big problem.

I personally don't understand that. It makes no sense because who we are serving is not Washington, who we are serving are the people who are trying to survive, are the people who are the beneficiaries of these charities or the charities who are doing the good works. That is why we are bringing this legislation to the floor. I am very excited to be a part of this.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all the Members on both sides of the aisle for their hard work in this area, and with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I shall consume.

Mr. Speaker, the issues here are not the merits. That isn't the issue. The issue is whether we proceed this way. Proceeding this way is the opposite of bipartisanship—its very opposite. The chairman has said he wants to find common ground on common aspects.

What this does is essentially pull terrain out from under common ground. It is the opposite of a search for common ground. The President has said he will veto. We have the messages right here once again. It is the opposite of bipartisanship.

It is also, if I might say, the opposite of certainty for taxpayers. We went through this last year. These bills will not become law, period. If they were to pass the House and the Senate, they would be vetoed. That happened last year. It did not become law. It will not become law this year.

These provisions will be continued if we don't pass tax reform. Mr. Chairman, you control the schedule. If you don't want to wait until December, do it earlier if tax reform doesn't become a reality.

That is another problem with this bill and these bills. They are the opposite of tax reform. You don't do tax reform in a piecemeal fashion. Dave Camp, to his credit, understood that, so he came up with a comprehensive package.

In the Senate, Republicans understand this. Senator BLUNT said last week:

As long as the Finance Committee feels there is an opportunity for overall tax reform, I think you are going to not see a quick response to individual bills coming over.

What could be clearer? What could be clearer?

This is also the opposite of fiscal responsibility.

You have here three opposites—really four, and four opposites make a big minus.

Fourteen billion is the cost of this bill and 79 billion, the next bill—that is 93. We marked up just a few hours ago in Ways and Means two more bills, one 42 billion and another one 177 billion—that is 219. And you add up those, over \$310 billion in terms of adding to the deficit.

There has been some talk about helping the middle class. Action is the opposite of platitudes. Where is the action on the child tax credit? Where is the action on the EITC also affecting working and middle class families? Where is the action on the work opportunity tax credit? Where is the action on the minimum wage? The answer is we are now several months into this session.

A reporter said to me, What is bill number one?

I said, I have no idea.

How about other bills that really address the needs of the middle class of this country?

As expressed in Ways and Means, so many of us are very opposed to what is really a counterproductive path here. The merits, again, are not the basic issue.

The basic issue, do we want to fly in the face of bipartisanship, fly in the face of certainty for taxpayers, fly in the face of tax reform, and fly in the face of fiscal responsibility? We should not be doing that. We should not be doing that.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I would like to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), the distinguished member from the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak very well about H.R. 641, the Conservation Easement Incentive legislation. I get confused sometimes by the discussion on the floor.

If I understand it, if you do it for a year or 2 years and you don't pay for it, that is good policy, that is good legislation, that is good for America, but if you go beyond that time, it is not good.

This is a piece of legislation that came up in 2006. In fact, my colleague Mr. THOMPSON brought it up. He and Chairman Camp did it. He and Mr. Gerlach, who retired last year, did it. This just makes good sense.

I can tell you something about this. It is not only bipartisan, it is bicameral. It is in the President's budget. If you are talking about trying to work together to get somewhere, isn't this it? Isn't this it?

Sometimes, we always try to bend the rules for something else, but this is about conservation. This is about allowing a landowner to set property aside. So I don't care if you are a farmer or a rancher, I don't care if you are a hunter or a hiker, I don't care if you

like to look at birds or hunt birds, there are over 65 associations around the country that say, Please do more of this, set this ground apart.

Now, if you are a farmer or a rancher, you can still work that ground. All you are saying is this is a set-aside, this ground can't be developed, we can't lose this ground.

This is so basic who we are as Americans. We are saying, Let's preserve what we have. Let's just keep what we have. Let's make sure that our kids can hunt, hike, and swim. Let's make sure that they can fish. Let's make sure they can do all those wonderful things that this land affords us to do.

Then it becomes, Gosh, this is about politics. It is not about policy. It is good policy. It has never been paid for. I just don't understand why, all of a sudden—now—why is it paid for?

I am only starting my third session here; but, my God, you would never do this back home. I wouldn't do this. I am an automobile dealer.

I couldn't do this to a customer and say, Yeah, it is okay now, but do you know what, later on, you are going to have to pay me for it.

And they say, Wait a minute, I thought you gave it to me.

No, no. We are going to take it back.

Mr. Speaker, there are millions of acres that have been set aside now. Why not give some permanency to this? We talk about tax reform. Let's give it some permanency. Let's do what makes sense for all of America.

Let's talk about preserving America's ground and making sure it doesn't go under development. People can still farm it, and they can still ranch on it. It just makes good sense.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am just asking our friends on the other side, let's think about what is good for the people we represent and not what is just good for the moment.

We have always done this in the past. It has only become a problem now because it is not a 1-year extender or a 2-year extender. Now, all of a sudden, we say, Well, let's just let people know this is the way it is always going to be from now until all time.

But, no, that is a bad idea to do that. You don't want to give anybody certainty. You don't want to give anybody permanency.

There is no time in my life that I would ever say to my friends, my family, or anybody I represent, This is just a temporary thing for me. Tomorrow, I may have a change of heart.

I just ask my friends, H.R. 641—Mr. THOMPSON is on this piece. Let's make sure that we move forward for America. Let's make sure that we set ground aside for the future.

Mr. LEVIN. It is now my pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), our distin-

guished whip, who is going to supply, if the gentleman will wait here, for a very clear answer.

Mr. HOYER. The ranking member didn't write my speech, so I am not sure what my answer to the distinguished gentleman's comments is, but I will say this to my friend, I am not for 1 year. I may vote for 1 year, but that is not what we ought to do. It ought to be paid for if it is 1 year, 2 years, permanent. There is no free lunch.

You are in the automobile business. People come into your automobile store, and they would say, I would like to have that car for \$10,000.

And you say, Now, look, I paid \$20,000 for that car. I can't sell it to you for \$10,000.

There is no free lunch. Unpaid tax cuts are a free lunch, a pretense that somehow it is just free, but I will tell my friend it is not free.

The chairman, who was the chairman of the Budget Committee, offered a budget which cuts food stamps \$125 billion. This bill is called the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act—\$125 billion cut in food stamps. I tell you my friend voted for a \$40 billion cut in food stamps in the farm bill.

I am not for free lunches. I am for a lot of these tax cuts, but I am not for taking it out of the mouths of children, I am not for taking it out of NIH, and I am not for taking it out of our national security. We have got to pay for what we buy, and I vote that way.

The chairman and I were one of 18 people one time that voted against a very popular bill that had to do with Social Security. We thought it was not paid for and not fiscally responsible, and he and I were one of 18 people in this House that voted against it.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I don't have much time, but maybe we can get some more. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I could not be in better or more agreement with you. I have watched for 6 years—an opportunity in a country with the greatest assets in the world—watched our working class, our middle-income people, our lower-income people suffer the greatest harm they have ever had in their life.

If this is truly about getting America back to work, putting food in the mouths of our children and being able to do all these things, the only one way to do that is to have a dynamic and robust economy. That is what I think we need to do.

I have watched it for 6 years. It is appalling what we have allowed to have happen in a country that has been blessed with so many things. It is just bad policy. We can't get beyond the politics. That is what is hurting our people.

It is not the fact that this is not being paid for because we are not manipulating it for a year or 2. The whole purpose of why we should be here is let's raise all America. Let's get every-

body looking up, being able to feed everybody. We shouldn't have to have programs for people who can't take care of themselves because, by their very nature, they can do that. We have all of that potential.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, I used to have a magic 1 minute. I don't have that now. I would be glad to participate in debate. We have had bad policy, I tell my friend.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I agree.

Mr. HOYER. Terrible policy.

I don't know about you, but I am for Simpson-Bowles. The problem with Simpson-Bowles for some people is it paid for what it did, just like the Camp bill. The Camp bill made tough choices, and it was a zero-sum game in the sense that it cut taxes and it paid for them—a zero-sum game—just like you had to run your business because, if you didn't run your business that way, you would have gone bankrupt.

Now, I fought for that for a very long period of time and voted that way, as I say, one of 18 with my friend from Wisconsin, but I tell my friend, yes, we are following bad policy.

This bill, you can argue for the merits. I get that. The next bill, you can argue for the merits, and the bill after that and the bill after that and the bill after that, and you have then caused \$600 billion in deficit spending that your kids and my kids will have to pay for because we are too old to be around long enough to pay for it.

□ 1500

So I rise against this bill not because I am against fighting hunger. Everybody ought to be against fighting hunger.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. But when you talk about fighting hunger, don't cut food stamps \$40 billion. Don't suggest the way we pay for this tax cut is to cut \$125 billion from food stamps over the next 10 years, as the chairman did.

I disagree with that policy, and I respect the chairman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. No, I can't yield any more because I am running out of time.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of two bills that we are considering on the floor this week to make tax cuts permanent, and it is unfortunate that neither of these bills is paid for 1 year or permanently. Together, they would increase the deficit by \$93 billion. Nobody is suggesting we are going to pay for that, so our kids will pay for it.

Democrats support extending many of the preferences we are talking about, but we are also deeply concerned about America's fiscal future. And I voted that way, not just talked that way.

I hear a lot of talk from my friends in the majority about the debt, but

that talk too often fails to translate into fiscally responsible policy. It didn't in 1981 when we cut taxes deeply and increased the national debt from the time I came in under Reagan 189 percent, more than any President that has been President during my term in the last 34 years.

We have seen these two tax bills before—when Republicans brought them to the floor last Congress, along with several other permanent tax cuts, which, together, would have ballooned the deficit by more than \$600 billion. That is twice what we will spend on medical research at NIH and 10 times what it would cost to expand community college access.

I also hear a lot of my friends on the other side of the aisle talk about a broken tax system. I tell my friend, that system is going to remain broken. That system is going to remain broken unless we do what Camp did.

Did I agree with everything that Camp did? No. But I respected him for putting together a package of tax reform that gives what Mr. RYAN says we need, and I agree with him—certainty. People need to know. These ought to all be permanent. The R&D tax credit ought to be permanent so people can plan.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. America's businesses and families deserve the certainty that comes from tax reform, not partisan piecemeal reform bills that undermine—undermine—tax reform. That is what ROY BLUNT was talking about.

ROY BLUNT has already been quoted, so I won't repeat the quote. But what he said is, as long as the Finance Committee feels there is an opportunity for overall tax reform, I think you are not going to see a quick response to individual bills coming over.

That is why this is bad policy; because you are not going to get from here to there unless you have a comprehensive bill that makes the tough tradeoffs and summons the courage of this Congress to pass meaningful, permanent, paid-for tax certainty for our citizens.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute to say I truly, sincerely want to say this.

I very much respect the majority whip. We have had a great relationship over the years. I very much respect the gentleman. He is a class act legislator. I look forward to his support of our coming work from the committee if he wants to be part of tax reform.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman.

That was the longest magic minute I think I have seen.

Mr. HOYER. No, I have done longer when I had the minute, believe me.

I want to tell the gentleman, in all sincerity, I look forward to being able

to support a bill that is comprehensive, paid for, and gives our citizens and individual taxpayers the certainty they need to have the confidence they need to grow our economy.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I just want to keep on my time.

Let me ask about the time allotment, by the way. Who is where.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Wisconsin has 37 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Michigan has 33½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, normally, I don't try to get into these baseline issues because it is kind of arcane budget issues. But here is where I think there is an inconsistency or a problem, and so people listening to this debate, there is a lot of confusion here.

If we were talking about a spending bill—let's just say the highway trust fund or TANF, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families—and it expired and we said, well, let's just extend this bill, this law, and the spending in it at its current levels for another 5, 6 years, we wouldn't have to "pay" for that. It wouldn't cost anything. It is already in the baseline. So if we were basically talking about a spending bill here, none of these kinds of criticisms would hold merit, would be usable.

So here we are talking about taxes, and so I think people are getting the impression from this debate that we are talking about a tax cut here, that we are talking about doing something to businesses or individuals and cutting their taxes. These are laws that are already on the books. Charities, that is what we are talking about here in this particular bill. All we are saying is don't raise their taxes. That is what we are saying here.

The choice before us is fairly obvious. Either we raise taxes on small businesses and individuals with respect to charitable giving, or we keep them where they are today and just go raise taxes on somebody else, or we acknowledge reality for what it is: they have these benefits, they have had these benefits, we all agree they ought to keep these benefits, and every year we renew these benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield myself an additional 30 seconds.

But we do it in such an awful way. We wait until the end of the year, then we do it retroactively or we do it 1 year. Nobody knows what is going on. Nobody can predict the Tax Code. Nobody can make decisions. As a result, these charities, these families, these small businesses suffer. That is what we are trying to fix here.

With that, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHOCK), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. SCHOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

I would just say so much has been said I am not sure I will need 3 minutes.

Obviously, I am here to speak in support of a measure that I introduced in this body last July that passed by a 2 to 1 majority. That means nearly every Republican and tens and scores of Democrats, a whole host of Democrats that passed by a 2 to 1 majority, voted for almost identical language contained in this bill.

Now, the negotiation in the agreement between the House and the Senate to make this more permanent fell apart, and so we did what we have always done, which is extend it for another year.

Just a few months ago—just a few months ago—Republicans and Democrats came together in this body to vote on identical legislation to extend it a year at a time. In fact, this piece of legislation has been extended four times since 2006 under the same proposal that we are submitting here, just not a year at a time but, rather, permanent, the same pay-fors or lack thereof, written almost identically.

So what is at stake? What is at stake is how much the people of our respective districts are going to benefit and whether they will benefit.

Back in my district, the head of the Galesburg Community Foundation says that, when he is meeting with donors, if they can give to their IRA, as this bill will allow, they give, on average, four times the amount of goods and services that they would otherwise give without the IRA donation provision—four times.

This isn't about the donor; it is about the recipient. And so I would just simply ask: Why don't we give the certainty not to the donor but, rather, give the certainty to the recipient, whether it be food and shelter, whether it be education benefits here in our country and around the world, a benefit from this provision, give them the certainty, do what we have always done, but do it early and do it now?

Rather, I would ask anyone who stands up to oppose this: 10 months from now, where will your vote be on a 1-year extension? Where will your vote be on a 2-year extension? What is wrong with making what we have been doing since 2006 1 year and 2 years at a time permanent?

It is important for us to give the certainty to the beneficiaries and to the communities who benefit from this provision. I urge a "yes" vote on this. And I hope, once again, as we did last July, this body will pass this bill with an overwhelmingly 2 to 1 majority.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

The answer to the gentleman is you pay for certainty. If you make something permanent, you should pay for it. And that is essentially what our chairman did when he chaired the Budget Committee. His budget never assumed these provisions were permanently in the baseline or he would never have

been able to say he balanced the budget in 10 years. That is the reality.

If you want to add hundreds of billions of dollars to the budget, you have got to face up to paying for them; otherwise, you squeeze out other necessary programs.

Mr. Speaker, it is now a pleasure to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of our committee, a very active member.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainty, we are told, is the key factor here—first words from Chairman RYAN in support of this bill. I think the first certainty we have here is the knowledge that this bill is part of a package that, approved through today, is certain to borrow \$317.5 billion. That is basically a request to this House and this Congress that we approve the borrowing of \$317.5 billion. And when you look at other measures they have approved in the past, they are really on a pathway to borrowing almost \$1 trillion to finance these tax cuts.

I believe that certainty is important to taxpayers. I think that when someone pays for Medicare and Social Security, they need to be certain that it will be there. They need to be certain that the water that they drink and the air they breathe is not contaminated. They need to be certain that the food that they put on their family's table is safe, that it has been inspected by a meat inspector or another type of health inspector. They need to be sure when they drive home, they need to have the certainty that the bridge that they drive over is not going to fall down, as it did in Minneapolis a few years back. They need to be certain that there is educational opportunity, quality education, for their children. They need to be able to do all this without just having to rely on charity.

This bill certainly selects a subset of tax provisions that benefit a few Americans and gives them preference. And I like some of these provisions. In fact, I am a cosponsor of some of these provisions, like the conservation easement. But they are measures that can and should be fully paid for instead of asking for another IOU. And because they are select provisions, they exclude many working and middle class American families.

For example, the American Opportunity Tax Credit, which is based on the principle that we want all Americans to be able to get postsecondary education in a college or a trade school, but a choice that they make and get \$2,500 directly off of their tax bill to pay for tuition and books; the child tax credit that so many American families claim to help with their children; the earned income tax credit that even President Reagan said was a key factor in getting people out of poverty, those are key provisions that were left over on the side and not selected for borrowing or for anything else.

It is certain that many Americans have been left out of this very costly package. Working families do need to

depend on more than charity. They need to be able to depend on this Congress to respond to their needs.

Now, there is seldom a week that goes by in the area of medical research that there is not a group here on Capitol Hill concerned with Alzheimer's research, multiple sclerosis, diabetes, Parkinson's, cancer, AIDS, or any number of dreaded diseases, basically saying: Find a cure for my family member or my neighbor; find a cure before I get this dreaded disease. There are groups that come here after the tough droughts we had here last year saying the Forest Service and the weather service need more resources in order to deal with the natural disasters associated with climate change.

□ 1515

We have been unable to find the funds for our crumbling roads and bridges. We do not have the investment we need from pre-K to postgraduate in education.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. DOGGETT. When you dig another hundreds of billions of dollars—or maybe \$1 trillion—into debt, it provides an excuse for many of those who don't believe in those programs to say: Gee, we would love to help you with education for your children, and, yes, it would be good if we had another meat inspector, but we just can't afford to do that.

So we get to the point that Mr. RYAN has raised: Why is it we should raise taxes on some in order to maintain and renew some expired tax credits for others? I think there are two reasons.

One is that some people are still not paying their fair share. We have got some multinational corporations that don't pay as much as a percent of their income as the people who clean up their offices. The second reason is that it is for the same reason that we say, if we need additional money for our national defense or for our educational and retirement security at home, we have to come up with the revenues to pay for that if we are to maintain any sense of fiscal responsibility.

There are some good provisions in this bill, but we need the certainty that we will not be digging ourselves deeper into debt, preventing our ability to meet other vital national needs for our families.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to say: I wonder what the reaction would be if we chose to change the way that the spending baseline is treated, such that, if any program in its authorization expired, then it would expire on the baseline, and you would have to offset the spending for renewing any program. I would be curious to see what the reaction would be for that.

I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. I thank the chairman for his leadership on leading the effort to simplify the Tax Code and give some confidence and certainty to those who use it.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, the America Gives More Act. This legislation is absolutely about helping those who are most in need. Those are our charities and our foundations across the country, which are working day in and day out to help those who are most in need.

There are a number of important tax rules that we have already discussed that are governing charitable donations and charitable organizations, but they have always been temporary. We have already had these provisions in law, and they have already expired, so here we are, acting under retroactivity already. It is time to get rid of these short-term fixes and embrace long-term solutions. This legislation simply makes the provisions permanent.

It encourages companies to donate food to help feed the hungry. It makes it easier for individuals who might want to use their money in their IRA retirement funds and give that money to charitable organizations to help others of all varieties. It incentivizes landowners to help protect and preserve our environment for future generations through conservation easements.

I want to just address one other provision that is in this bill, which I actually authored with my colleague, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, to help simplify the Tax Code for private foundations. He has been a very strong advocate in leading this effort.

I think we would all agree that private foundations make a world of difference in our communities. We all have them in our States. I know, in Minnesota, we have 1,400 different foundations that donate about \$1 billion annually to all of those who are in need. Across the country, there is something like 86,000 foundations that give tens and tens and tens of billions of dollars. Now, these are really impressive figures, but the truth is those figures could actually be a lot higher, and here is why.

The foundation community has come to us, and they are telling us that the Tax Code is discouraging them from actually giving large donations. Today, these institutions face a really complex, cumbersome, two-tiered system of taxation that requires them to pay either a 1 percent or a 2 percent excise tax on their investment income, but in order to qualify for the low rate in any given year, they have got to go and donate an amount greater than the average of their 5-year rolling average from the previous 5 years.

This, actually, creates a very perverse disincentive for these foundations to not make any donations of large amounts in times when we might have a natural disaster, when there are economic tough times. Absolutely now, this is because a large donation in

these times would significantly increase a private foundation's 5-year average and make it difficult for them to actually qualify for the lower rate. It also makes sure that they are not going to get the low rate for the next 4 years. We are eliminating this disincentive by replacing a very complicated, two-tiered system with a simple, flat, 1 percent excise tax on all private foundation investment income.

It is important to simplify the tax planning process especially for smaller foundations, because they are the ones who are spending money on accountants and lawyers to navigate the Tax Code when those are valuable resources that could actually be used to help give grants to others who need those resources. This bill simply makes sure that charitable giving decisions are going to be based not on the Tax Code but on the needs of our communities.

The bottom line is: every dollar that these organizations are paying in taxes is one less dollar that they are giving to those who truly need it. I ask my colleagues to join in supporting this legislation.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, it is now my real pleasure to yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California, NANCY PELOSI, our distinguished leader.

Ms. PELOSI. I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership on helping to have a budget that produces growth to reduce the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, today, we are talking about issues on which we are very much in agreement in terms of the policy toward charitable giving. In fact, some of this legislation has been introduced by Mr. LEVIN and Mr. THOMPSON on the Ways and Means Committee, in fact, in offering an amendment in Rules last night, which was rejected by the Rules Committee, to go forward in a way that was fiscally sound and was paid for.

Here is the problem that we have. We all want to have comprehensive tax reform, where we can close loopholes and we can lower the tax rate and we can have transparency in our Tax Code. In order to go to the table to do that—and I know there is bipartisan interest in doing so—we should go to the table with as much freedom as possible and not constrained by taking rifle shots on the floor of the House for certain pieces of the Tax Code. The whole package that the Republicans are putting forth is about \$800 billion. That is a lot of money.

It is important for people to know that, in our budget every year, we have a part of the budget that is called tax expenditures. They are well over \$1 trillion. Some of them are worthy, and we want to protect them—certainly, charitable deductions fall in that category—but many of them are not. Many of those tax expenditures, which means giving a tax break whether it is special interest loopholes in the Tax Code to special interests, do not create growth. They increase the deficit, and

they are just like spending. They are called expenditures because they are giving a tax break to certain special interests.

Okay. How does that fit in here?

We want to go to the table—put everything on the table—and subject it to agnostic scrutiny to say: What works for growth? What is fair about transparency? How do we proceed in a way that lowers the corporate rate? increases the revenue to the budget? that has fairness, simplicity, and transparency?

What the Republicans are proposing this week is totally in opposition to our being able to do that effectively. What they are saying is let us take \$800 billion—permanently, unpaid for—out of the mix, and then we have less to negotiate on in terms of what we can do on the other side of the budget, which are investments into the future.

I have always said—and I think that most economists would agree—that nothing brings more money to the Treasury or reduces the deficit more than investments in education—early childhood education, K-12, higher ed, postgraduate—lifelong learning. That is about growth. That is about bigger paychecks, confidence to spend, demand injected into the economy, jobs created, revenue produced. It is all part of how we can go forward with a budget for the future that creates growth and reduces the deficit.

So we have this obstacle, which sounds very good. How do you vote against these provisions, which are good provisions, about nonprofits and conservation and all of these other things? We agree—as I say, our colleagues have introduced them—but then you say that they are permanently unpaid for. Again, mixing some of the good with the not so good is like a Trojan horse moving in. It looks good, but wait a minute. There is a lot in the gut of that horse that is not good for growth or for reducing the deficit.

All we are saying to everyone today is we can come to agreement on some of the principles about tax deductions for charitable organizations. It is curious to hear our colleagues talk so movingly about providing food for hungry people when very few of them want to vote for food stamps, but that is a whole other issue. It just shows some inconsistency in all of this.

Just remember this one thing: if we want to have comprehensive tax reform—if we want to reduce the deficit, if we want to have balance in terms of investments plus how we produce revenue—we have to do it in a comprehensive way. That is what a budget is about. What we are doing today is to throw up, to just stack the deck against any investments in growth, because we have already taken \$800 billion off the table if we go down this path.

What we are doing today is to say other tax reforms that we want to make for fairness are already in jeop-

ardy because of some of what is in this. As I say, some are positive and some are not. Let's be discerning in how we make the judgment. You can't be discerning by saying: I am going to vote for permanent, unpaid-for tax expenditures—which, as I say, have a blend of positive and negative in them, but it is hard to make a distinction without seeing the whole, big picture of it.

I urge my colleagues to say: While I support some of what is good in all of this, I do not support permanently taking it off the table for consideration and not paying for it at this time.

In order to talk this through and have a clear instead of this drive-by approach to tax policy—an antideficit exploding spree that our Republican colleagues are on while they profess to be deficit hawks—and while we are working this out and having a discussion about this, we, in our motion to recommit, will have a 1-year extension of the provision that we are talking about here so that, okay, in the course of this time, we will go forward with a tax extender for 1 year.

Hopefully, in that time, under the leadership of the Budget chair, who is also from the Ways and Means Committee—he understands these issues very well. In fact, his own budget would not be consistent with what he is putting on the floor today as he is the former chair of Ways and Means, now of the Budget Committee. No. It is the reverse, but it is related. They are so related because how we produce revenue is so essential to how we do our budget, and the gentleman knows that because his own budget would be inconsistent with what is on the floor today.

So I say to my colleagues: Hold on. Vote “no” on this. Vote “yes” on the motion to recommit, which gives us a year to talk this through but to do so in a way that reduces the deficit, produces growth, makes bigger paychecks from that growth to increase more revenue, and we would have these provisions go forth in a way that is fair, that is paid for, and that is part of comprehensive tax reform.

With that, again, I thank the gentleman for his exceptional leadership and the members of the Ways and Means Committee for their courage in opposing something that has popular appeal. There is a reason why. They are not bad policies. It is just that they are not paid for, and they are permanent. We should do this, but we should do it right. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the bill and “yes” on the motion to recommit.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I want to say to the gentlewoman, the minority leader, that I appreciate the tone and the temperament of her remarks. I thought that was well done.

□ 1530

I disagree with the basic premise on baseline. I won't get into the details. I talked about that a little bit before.

So I have some differences of opinion on the facts as she laid them out. I see it quite differently. But I thought that was a good tone and temperament that speaks well to the need for tax reform that is comprehensive. We believe that this helps move us in the right direction toward tax reform.

I won't go to the baseline issues again, only to say I think this is a positive step in the direction toward comprehensive tax reform, which clearly the gentlewoman—meaning both parties—agree is something that we have to tackle.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. I thank Chairman RYAN for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California said that we needed to use agnostic scrutiny when we are evaluating these. I think it is a little bit ambitious to have a roomful of agnostics when we are all true believers. We all come in with an agenda.

An agnostic, Mr. Speaker, would look at the four things in the bill that we are contemplating today and would say of all four of these things: Surely these are not going to get caught up and swept away in tax reform; surely, it is not going to be how we are treating food charities; surely, it is not going to be how we are dealing with conservation easements; surely, it is not how we are treating IRA contributions to charities; and surely, it is not trying to make private foundations and give them a sure footing. Surely, these are the things we can all agree on based on agnostic scrutiny.

Did you notice something, Mr. Speaker? There is nobody on the other side of the aisle who has stood up today and said: The food charity thing? Disaster. I'm against that. Or: Conservation easements? Ridiculous. Look into that a little bit more. Or: The IRA contributions? Be careful there. Or: Private foundations, getting them all squared away? I'm against it. Not one person said that.

So what was their argument? They wrap themselves up in process. But by wrapping themselves up in process, they have opened themselves up to criticism, because if we had gone a different route, if the chairman had taken a different path, they would have said: Chairman RYAN, why don't you start on things where there is bipartisan agreement? And here the chairman is bringing bills to the floor that have been enthusiastically, actively supported, Mr. Speaker, by our friends on the other side of the aisle. Why have they supported them? Because they are good ideas. This is where there is an incredible amount of common ground.

There have been some false arguments made on the other side that are just not that persuasive, and the argument by the gentleman from Texas created the impression that if you vote "yes" on this, then we are not going to

be able to afford meat inspectors. We are not going to be able to have bridges or a cure for cancer. It is somehow out of our reach. Spare me.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded at times like this of a letter that Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1790 to a man named Charles Clay. I am going to give you three lines from this letter that I have committed to memory because I think it deeply resonates where most Americans are when they look at our House today.

Thomas Jefferson wrote this to Charles Clay. He said:

The ground of liberty is to be gained by inches. We must be content what we can get from time to time and eternally press forward for what is yet to get. It takes time to persuade men even to do what is for their own good.

Mr. Speaker, that is Jefferson's admonition—no stranger to vision, no stranger to the big picture as the author of the Declaration of Independence.

We don't walk away from tax reform, the aspiration that we all have, but it is to say: Look, if we are going to be agnostically scrutinizing these things, even an agnostic would say this ought not to be caught in the crossfire.

We ought to vote "yes" for this bill and move it along.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Essentially, what the gentleman from Illinois says is: Well, let's do tax reform by picking and choosing a piece or a few at a time.

That is the opposite of tax reform. He described it. That is the difference.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a very distinguished member of our committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Democratic lead on the conservation easement bill and to very regrettably say that I rise in opposition to this bill that I think so highly of.

I don't disagree with the policy. I don't disagree with the need for certainty, something that has been referred to many times today. And I don't disagree that the way the Republicans did it last year—in the last 2 weeks and doing it retroactively—I don't disagree that that was the wrong way to do it.

I have worked for permanency on conservation easements ever since Chairman Camp and I passed the big expansion in 2006. I have been the Democratic lead in every Congress to make conservation easements permanent.

Conservation easements are good public policy. They protect open space. They protect important ag lands. They protect important wildlife habitat. They are essential for clean air and clean water. They are essential for locally sourced good, healthy food. They are important to hunters, to fishermen, to conservationists.

They are important to people who live in rural areas and they are important to people who live in urban areas. Nowhere is that more apparent than what happened in New York. We were able to save New York City from having to spend \$8 billion in building a water filtration system because we were able to protect their watershed area, in large part through conservation easements.

We all know that these are important. Every one of us knows it is important. That is why every Congress, when we introduce this bill, we get upward of and sometimes over 300 bipartisan coauthors on the bill, but the problem is this bill isn't paid for, as you have heard a number of times.

Sadly, I offered an amendment that would have totally offset the cost of the conservation easement portion of the bills that we are taking up today. It was an offset with no tax increases. It didn't increase anybody's taxes, didn't put the taxes on the back of somebody else, didn't shift the cost to anyone else. As a matter of fact, it focused on scofflaws who have been able to avoid paying their taxes because of a short statute of limitations. We offered to extend that statute of limitations. We could have paid for this whole thing. Unfortunately, my friends on the Republican side of the House rejected that amendment.

So instead, we are here with this bill, not paid for. Instead, today, we are going to vote on \$93 billion worth of unpaid-for tax bills that will add \$93 billion to our deficit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. If you add that to what our Republican colleagues did in the Ways and Means Committee this morning when they passed \$225 billion of unpaid-for tax expenditures, that means that just today the Republican side of this House spent \$320 billion that we don't have, directly shifting the cost to our deficit and our debt.

This is not tax reform, Members, and this is not paid for. It is not a good way to proceed, and I ask for a "no" vote.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished member from New York (Mr. REED), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. REED. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the underlying bill, the America Gives More Act of 2015. In particular, Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about a bill that is near and dear to me, and that is the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act, which is a subpart of this underlying bill.

The ranking member and I had a conversation the last time this legislation was before the House for consideration. We got a large bipartisan vote in support of the fighting hunger provisions.

And I know the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan, has worked extensively on this legislation for years and years and years. I know in our last debate and conversation here that the ranking member had some concerns that I questioned whether or not he cared about the people that were going to be helped by this act.

I want to make it clear here today, Mr. Speaker, I understand the ranking member cares about those individuals, just as I do—just as all of us, as Democrats and Republicans, should be focusing this debate not necessarily always about the arguments of D.C. but about the people that we came here to represent and help.

Fighting hunger is a bipartisan issue. We unite as Americans when our fellow citizens are suffering. When you look at the millions of Americans who are going hungry every day, Mr. Speaker, we shouldn't be divisive. We shouldn't be arguing about the details of what my opponents on the other side are putting forth today.

We should stand for those millions of Americans, where we say this tax policy is going to result in tons and tons of food not going into landfills, not going into the garbage, but going onto the tables of our fellow Americans that could use that food the most: the hungry, the poor.

And we can argue whether there are other ways to do it and there are other things that we can do to help them, but we can agree that this is one piece of a solution to this problem that we could pass today and move the needle and care for our fellow Americans.

That is why I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation. We don't want food going into landfills. We want food to be put on the table of the people that need it most.

We have concerns about the debt on both sides. I get it. But here is an opportunity for us to come together. I am concerned about the debt. My colleagues are concerned about the debt. But here is an opportunity for us to show the American people that sent us here that we care about them, we are listening to the American people, and we are willing to do something about it in order to make sure that this policy results in that food going to our fellow citizens who need it most.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, if could I ask how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) has 22½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has 21½ minutes remaining.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA), another distinguished member of our committee, the chairman of our Caucus.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think we should clarify something. Every day, Americans donate food, clothes, and money to charities. Mil-

lions of Americans do that all the time. Most of those Americans don't expect to get something in return. They do it because it is the right thing to do, and it makes them feel like they are part of the American community. So every day Americans are giving.

Now, the Tax Code happens to also try to encourage us to do more giving, which I think all of us agree is good. So let's remove that from the debate because I think we are confusing folks who might be watching this.

This isn't about trying to give people an incentive to give because Americans are doing it whether or not the Tax Code says to them: We want you to do this.

The issue is this. Under the Tax Code, some Americans—not a majority of Americans, not even a third of Americans, but a fraction of Americans—can take advantage of the provisions in the Tax Code that give them tax breaks for having given something.

You have heard a discussion about food. If you gave canned goods because the boy next door put up a bag and you put canned goods in there and you gave them away, this provision isn't about that. No. There are a fraction of American taxpayers, mostly companies, restaurants, and so forth, who can take advantage of that. You can't. Americans can't take advantage of that provision.

Say you have an IRA, or Individual Retirement Account. Some Americans have an IRA. The majority of Americans don't, but some do. You want to be charitable. Say you have done fairly well. You want to give some of your IRA to a charity. The Tax Code says: We want to incentivize you to do that.

□ 1545

The Tax Code right now says you can give up to \$100,000 in your IRA to charity. Guess what? That won't be recognized as income.

How many Americans make \$100,000? Not too many—but say you make \$100,000. How much are you going to pay in taxes? How many of you have \$100,000 in your IRA that you give away to a charity? Well, there are some people who can, and there are some people who do. Guess what? They get a tax break for doing that.

It is a pretty big tax break if you think about how much you would pay in taxes on \$100,000 of your income. They get to give that money away. Guess what? They don't get taxed a cent on that \$100,000 that they just gave out of that IRA that they can do. By the way, you don't get to just do it once in your lifetime. Every year, an American can give away \$100,000 out of your IRA and get the tax break.

How many Americans do that? A tiny, tiny fraction—but guess what? When you take that IRA rollover tax break and you take that other tax break for those companies that can give away food and you take the other tax breaks for those who have land that they could give away to a charity, guess how much it adds up to?

It adds up to what we, today, provide in funding to do research against breast cancer and all the research funding we put in to do Alzheimer's research, the same amount of money.

When people say, You don't have to worry about the cost of that, you don't have to pay for this—well, we could spend twice as much money to find a cure for breast cancer, twice as much money to find a cure for Alzheimer's disease, if we weren't giving away these tax breaks to somebody who can afford to give away \$100,000 in their IRA every year to do good.

By the way, that wealthy American could give \$100,000 out of that IRA today, but they get a tax break for doing it. Would that stop them from giving away \$100,000 just because they don't get the tax break? I don't think so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. BECERRA. I don't think so because you don't have to be wealthy in America to give. We all want to give. In fact, the folks who give the most are the folks who earn the least. They give what they can.

How many times have you been invited to someone's home who you know it is hard for them to put food on the table, and they invite you to eat at their home, and they don't expect you to give them a thing?

We give because we think it is the right thing to do. The Tax Code wants to incent that, and that is good because we want to help charity.

To say that it doesn't have to be paid for, when we have to pay for all the cancer research, for breast cancer, when we have to pay for the research to cure Alzheimer's disease, when we have to pay for those food inspectors to make sure that the food that gets on our table is free of carcinogens and diseases and microbes that could endanger us—absolutely, we have to pay for those things. As it was said earlier, there is no free lunch.

All we are saying is this: Let's do good. If we are going to give someone who is wealthy a chance to do good, let's pay for it. Let's figure out a way to do that because we want to be charitable, but let's not play this game that it doesn't cost somebody in America for this tax break to go mostly to wealthy folks.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished House majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and the chairman for yielding.

I have to pause for a moment. We debate a lot of things on this floor, and they are worthy debates, and they are interesting debates, but let's first, Mr. Speaker, tell the American people what we are debating today. Fighting Hunger Incentive Act, that is what we are debating.

Lots of times, I question why we have debates on the floor certain times. Right now is one of them. I really wonder if the American people tuned in today and said: You were really having an argument against Fighting Hunger Incentive Act?

Let me walk through what we are debating because, just a couple of days ago, I just went down the road here to the D.C. Central Kitchen. It is a non-profit, feeds a lot of homeless, also helps people build jobs.

You know how it was created? Because a small businessman saw people who were hungry, then he saw an inaugural for the 41st President of the United States and said: Should that food all be wasted?

He took the leftovers and found someone who needed it. Then he went further and he goes: You know what, these people coming to eat, what they really need is they need a job, so why don't I create a culinary school?

Ninety-nine classes have gone through this culinary school. And you know what? I met this young man who went through class number two. Early in his life, he did some things wrong, and he was incarcerated for more than 20 years.

But you know what his life is today? He is the supervisor for 8 years. He has a 5-year-old daughter, and he has a college fund for that daughter. That is because the current Tax Code allows it to happen.

Mr. Speaker, when I listen to the other side, you would think we are creating a whole new bill. We are taking a Tax Code and extending it, instead of having a problem when someone wonders: Will I still get that donation?

So I asked them, I see how many people you feed here and the number of volunteers—if you want to volunteer at the D.C. Central Kitchen, you have to sign up, and the opening is in May because people want to give back.

They say 60 percent of all the food they get is donated. They get fish that would actually go into a dump beforehand. But you know what? It is not easy, if you are a small farm somewhere else, to donate it.

This incentive allows it happen. Why? Because one person saw a need—he didn't go to government to do it, but he used the system to actually enhance and build it up.

I don't have to just go to D.C. to see this. I see this in my own community. My wife and I go down to the mission in Kern County. I see lives changed. I see people fed.

But you know what? I see all walks of life. I was down to feed the mission one day, and a person that was just a couple of lines behind it in there to get food went to the same elementary school as me and the same junior high and the same high school. That is the greatness of this country, that we are willing to help one another.

Mr. Speaker, I just don't understand. If we are willing to help each other, why do we have to fight to make it allowed to do that?

There are worthy fights on this floor, but this is not one. We are better than this, Mr. Speaker. I will tell you this: What I am most amazed and dumbfounded by, this bill has a veto threat.

This bill to help hunger, to help the next Dawain, to help the next individual be fed, has a veto threat.

You know what? I read the veto threat. The administration doesn't oppose the provision because it is already in law.

So many times, people say: Why do you wait till the last minute in this House? Well, we are not now. We are taking it up early, so nobody has a problem.

But you know what the administration, Mr. Speaker, the President said? He is threatening to veto this bill because Congress didn't pass other bills the President wanted and because the President might oppose future bills that the House could pass.

Seriously? That is just wrong. Mr. Speaker, I believe in this country. I believe in mankind. I believe in the goodness of all of us. It is not about party. It is about helping one another.

We are fighting for the incentive to end hunger and encouraging others to do it. We shouldn't have to debate about it. We should celebrate it.

I look forward to this bill passing with a large majority and the President signing it and all of us, as Americans, coming together to help the most precious because it is in every single one of our communities, hunger.

Let's put our political games aside, Mr. Speaker, and let's rise to what people expect of this House, to help the common good.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

I think the majority leader is leaving the floor, but I want him to hear me. I am an original if not the original sponsor of the provision regarding food donation. I have a son and daughter-in-law who are working on this very issue.

The issue is this: the majority leader helped lead an effort to cut food stamps by \$40 billion. The argument was we could not afford it. Now, they come forth here with a provision that they don't want to pay for, added to other provisions that will cost \$200 billion, \$300 billion, going to \$700 billion or \$800 billion.

That puts a bad name on the notion of commitment. Commitment needs to have some consistency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS).

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have long supported the tax incentive for businesses to deduct charitable contributions of food inventory. Indeed, I have a bill to expand the deduction for non-C corps, as does the bill under consideration.

The food inventory deduction allows us to help stock America's food banks and feed the hungry. Importantly, we need to address the food inventory deduction because, unlike other business

tax extenders, the food deduction provision cannot be useful if extended retroactively. If it expires, our hunger relief organizations miss out on potential donations of food.

In Chicago, where I live, one in six people, including children, do not know where their next meal is coming from.

In addition to advancing charitable and S corps tax provisions, this committee should be prioritizing the permanent extension of the earned income tax credit to help the working poor afford food and other basic needs for their families.

We should be prioritizing the new market tax credits to help distressed communities so that the hungry can have jobs so that they can purchase their own food and not rely on food banks.

Although I strongly support incentivizing charitable donations of food inventory, I do not support passing unpaid for, permanent, and piecemeal tax breaks while the needs of other vulnerable citizens go unmet.

We should be considering the EITC, AOTC, new market tax credit, work opportunity tax credit, tuition and fees deduction, teacher tax benefits, Promise Zones, and hundreds of other tax provisions that help our communities and our people.

One of the things that I have learned—if I know nothing else—is something that Frederick Douglass was known for saying, that in this world, you may not get everything that you pay for, but you most certainly will pay for everything that you get, and if you don't pay one way, then you will definitely pay another way.

The price of increasing the deficit, not providing a broad, comprehensive tax reform effort, is something that we ought not be paying for. The principles and concepts in many of the provisions, obviously, we agree, but we do not agree that you can go on paying for what it is that you need.

Mr. Speaker, I will vote "no" on these provisions.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2015.

Roughly one in 10 Minnesotans live in poverty. Sadly, this means that many Minnesotans, including children, lack access to the food and resources they need to maintain a healthy and active lifestyle.

This morning, I had an opportunity to tour and make sandwiches at Martha's Table, an organization here in D.C. that reaches more than 18,000 people through their programs. I saw firsthand the need for legislation like this.

This legislation will permanently extend the enhanced charitable deduction for all businesses that donate food to charities and food banks. This will encourage more businesses to chip in and help in the ongoing fight against hunger.

We have an obligation to help those around us, and this is a nonpartisan, bipartisan way to make a big difference.

□ 1600

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), our ranking member on the Committee on the Budget so dedicated to these issues. If he needs more time, he should just ask.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I thank my friend from Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, things are not always what they seem, and this is one of those cases. It is unfortunate because tax incentives for charitable giving are the kind of issues we should be handling in a bipartisan way. We should be working together in a bipartisan manner to reform our Tax Code and this as part of that.

Unfortunately, we are not doing that today, and this bill along with the series of other bills that will be coming to the floor in the days to come will add \$350 billion to our deficit over the next 10 years.

Mr. Speaker, most of the bills that are coming next are permanent extensions of tax breaks to major corporations. In the process, they don't pay for any of that. They don't close a single corporate tax loophole to provide those tax breaks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am holding in my hand the budget that Republicans passed in this House just a year ago. Now we have the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means—he was chairman of the Committee on the Budget, a good friend of mine. In their budget last year, they said they would not do what they are doing today. They passed a budget saying they would not have tax extenders that added to the deficit. I am reading right here from the budget that I think passed unanimously with Republican votes. It says they will only do these tax extenders if such measures would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2015 to 2024.

Here we are, less than a year later, throw their budget out the door. Why did it matter? Because last year they wanted to pretend their budget was in balance after 10 years, and they knew that if you had these tax extenders that were unpaid for, they wouldn't have a balanced budget. It wasn't balanced anyway, but no matter, that is why they did it.

Now, why does this matter beyond the fact that the Republican majority did one thing last year and is doing something different today? It matters because when you increase the deficits, our Republican colleagues are going to come right back around to us and say: You know what? The deficits are going to go up, and so we have to cut some of the investments that are supposed to help vulnerable people—the very people our Republican colleagues say they want to help today. They are going to say: Deficits are going up. We have got to cut those programs.

You know how we know that? Even before they increase the deficit like they are doing today, they were cutting those investments last year. In fact, while they are claiming to fight hunger today, here is what the budget from last year did: it would have cut the food and nutrition programs by 20 percent, \$137 billion. That would have ended nutrition assistance for 3.8 million Americans.

Now, I heard one of my friends and colleagues, Mr. ROSKAM from Illinois, saying Democrats are opposing this.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. I heard some of our colleagues saying we are opposing this on the basis of process. Really? Cutting nutrition assistance programs for 3.8 million Americans is process?

You know what else their budget did? It cut the category of spending that we use for the Women, Infants, and Children program to the point that 200,000 women, infants, and children would have been cut off of supplemental nutrition assistance under the Women, Infants, and Children program. Process? Really? I thought our colleagues were saying they wanted to fight hunger.

That budget last year, the one I am holding in my hands that passed here, you know what else it did? It did not extend tax credits for vulnerable people. It did not extend the earned income tax credit bump up. It did not extend the child tax credit. At the same time, they had a budget, and I suspect they will again this year, that cuts the top income tax rate for millionaires. That is what they do.

We can do a lot better, Mr. Speaker. That is what Democrats are saying. We can make these reforms to the Tax Code. We can make the charitable deduction permanent, but we can do it in a way that doesn't hurt other programs for hungry people. We can help hungry people through one mechanism without hurting those same people through another mechanism. That is why the President said he was going to veto this bill, not because it helps the deduction for charitable giving. This is a bill that says we are going to help some hungry people. But you know what? We are going to do something else in our budget that actually hurts those same hungry people even more, much more.

Now, I am also holding in my hand the Democratic budget that was presented last year. You know what we do? We permanently extended this charitable deduction—permanently—just like this bill. But you know what we did not do?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend.

So I just want to be clear. In our budget, we extended permanently this charitable deduction to fight hunger, the fighting hunger incentive. We did that.

But you know what we did not do? We did not cut the food and nutrition program, SNAP, by 20 percent. You know what we did not do? We did not cut the part of the budget that funds the Women, Infants, and Children program so that 200,000 people would not have the benefit of that.

You know what we did do? We cut a lot of the corporate tax breaks. We said we should not have a Tax Code that actually rewards American companies that move American jobs and capital overseas, so we would cut down on those. In that way, we were able to pay for them. That way, Mr. Speaker, we were able to extend the charitable deduction permanently, but we were also able to avoid cutting the Women, Infants, and Children program and avoid cutting the food and nutrition programs. That is what we are saying.

Unfortunately, the bill before us today, what they are saying is, by increasing the deficit, yes, we are going to extend this program to fight hunger; but, on the other hand, when their budget comes around next year, they are actually going to pass stuff that hurts those same people even more.

What we are saying is we don't have to help people by hurting people. We can do it all if we are willing to cut some of those corporate tax breaks, tax expenditures, spinning the Tax Code for major corporations that are put there because they have good lobbyists in Washington.

So let's do this the right way. That's the way we did it in the Democratic budget last year. That is the way we will do it in the Democratic budget again this year. Let's not help people by hurting other people or even hurting the people we are trying to help.

Mr. Speaker, I regretfully urge that we reject this bill and do this the right way.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KNIGHT).

Mr. KNIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I have gotten to sit during this debate, and for the last hour or more I got to listen to nobody arguing, nobody wondering that this is a bad idea, nobody saying that this is something we shouldn't do.

When you walk around your district—and me being a freshman, I get to hear all my friends. You know, you never ask your friend whether you are a liberal or a conservative or a Democrat or Republican. You just talk to your friends. Friends always ask me: Why don't you get something done?

As a State legislator in California, it was difficult for us to get some things done. I was always frustrated about that. I never liked to hear the term "ABC"—Anywhere but California. But the reason that term came up was because of certainty, was because businesses didn't know what we were going

to do from year to year. That is exactly what we are talking about today—certainty. “Certainty” is just not a word that we throw around. “Certainty” is something that has meaning. If we are going to extend this for, now, 7, 8 years in a row, it is obviously a good idea.

Going back and forth and volleying back and forth saying that this is a great idea, we all agree, we just want to do it on a 1-year basis, doesn't give certainty, doesn't give that reliability that this is good policy, we all believe in it, and we can get what we desire out of it.

When we go back to our districts and we go to our food pantries or we go to places that are helping the needy and helping the people that need it, feed people that need to be fed, wouldn't you like to go back there and say: “You know what? This is not something we are going to kick back and forth next year or the next year. This is something that is going to be on the books. We have sheer certainty about this”?

So listening to this debate and listening to what is happening of these four measures is what I draw out of this. What I draw, what we can get today: bipartisan, moving this forward, getting certainty for these measures that we seem to all agree upon.

Mr. LEVIN. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. At this time, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman.

As I have been sitting here, I have to admit, my thoughts have changed back and forth. My mind has changed. My speech has changed dramatically.

It occurred to me: I think my friends on the other side of the aisle are asking the wrong question. The question should not be: What is this going to cost the taxpayers? The question should be: What will the cost to the taxpayers be if we let these deductions expire?

Then it occurred to me, in listening to some of the speeches, that there is not a lack of sincerity in the desire to feed hungry people, not on their side, and certainly not on our side. I grieve when somebody's sincerity is questioned in this way. But I think what the question is is: Who do you trust to deliver the solution to people's needs, to people's hunger? What about college education? What about women's shelters? Who is best prepared to deliver those resources and those services?

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, it is charity. It is charity. The Sermon on the Mount wasn't communicated to the Congress; it was communicated to the congregation. It wasn't delivered to the democracy; it was delivered to the disciples. Our Tax Code ought not punish charity; it ought to lift it up.

I think we are asking the wrong question: Who is best prepared to deliver these services?

I think the other wrong question is we are arguing over what is not in the bill sometimes as opposed to what is. I wish there was more in it. I wish that we could include life income tools and the charitable IRA rollover. The chairman knows that. I hope to get to that. But I also know that incremental change is better than no change. Incremental progress is better than no progress. I hope we can get to comprehensive tax reform. I am confident we can. But today I am asking our colleagues, let's do what we can do. What we can do is this bill that is in front of us. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), another member of our committee.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me this time.

It is unfortunate we are here today, once again, in a situation where I think the overall intent sounds very good: charitable giving, helping the poor, helping the hungry. Quite often that is something you hear from our side of the aisle. In fact, all last year we had done the food stamp challenge. We had done a number of things to bring focus and attention to the plight of the hungry in the United States, and it is a bit raw to hear my colleagues on the other side of the aisle speak about their solution to this issue as a tax bill unpaid for that adds more than \$14 billion back on to our national deficit and to our debt, ultimately.

The President announced that he would cut the deficit in half within 4 years. He has now reduced the deficit by over a trillion dollars, from \$1.4 trillion to a little bit over \$400 billion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LEVIN. I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. CROWLEY. Not perfect. We still have a ways to go. But isn't that remarkable? A Democratic President that reduced the deficit, was handed a deficit of over a trillion dollars by his Republican predecessor, and now this President can lay claim—and I think rightfully so—to having reduced the deficit, yearly deficit, by over a trillion dollars.

Yet here are my Republican colleagues. Once again, they see an opportunity to add on to the deficit again here in this particular measure by \$14.3 billion. It doesn't sound like much, but when you add up the whole package, it is well over \$300 billion you want to add back to the Nation's deficit. I think it is wrong. I think most Americans think that is wrong. Democrat, Republican, it matters not. We are making progress. You are putting that on the back of future generations. The hungry that you pretend to be taking care of today are going to have to try to pay for these bills in the years to come. I think this is wrongheaded. I hope that my colleagues on this side do not support this measure.

□ 1615

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO).

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one thing that is particularly of pride for organizations and individuals in southeastern Pennsylvania is the success of the Chester County Food Bank and many other food banks.

Fighting food insecurity is something that you wouldn't think is a real problem in the more wealthier enclaves of this country, yet there are those who wake up every morning not knowing where their meal is going to come from. Food banks provide a very valuable service. The Fighting Hunger Incentive Act aims to assist our food banks and assist organizations and individuals to help fight hunger. That is what this bill is about. We should pass it, and we should move on in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

We have heard a lot of discussion about many of these programs, maybe most of all about food programs. But really, let's look at it beyond the rhetoric. Essentially when it comes to food programs, what the Republicans are doing is giving with one hand while they take with another. And there is much more that they take than they would give.

The food provision here comes to \$2.2 billion. They have chopped \$40 billion from food stamps; that is 20 times more. As the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) pointed out, when you add in WIC and other programs, they have cut way over \$100 billion. And they say they had to do that, in part, because they could not afford it.

So they come forth with bills that are going to add to the deficit, and that shows what this is all about, because they pass these bills adding to the deficit, and then they come back and they say, Sorry, when it comes to other needed programs, we don't have the money.

Indeed, not only do they give with one hand and take with another, and much more, but they give an empty hand, an empty hand like this—nothing in it—for the Child Tax Credit, for the Work Opportunity Tax Credit, for the New Markets provision that really matters, for the EITC. And then they say, Well, we can't afford it, yet they won't close the tax loopholes. It is so inconsistent.

I think in terms of the impact on human beings, it is not only inadequate but it is impersonal.

So we come here fortified. We are determined to do the right thing when it comes to tax reform. We are going to do the right thing when it comes to other important issues, including fiscal responsibility. And we are going to make sure that there are the funds available for needed programs because we have paid for things.

I strongly urge a “no” vote. That really is standing up for the right thing

when it comes to bipartisanship, to tax reform, and to fiscal responsibility.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

I guess I will just try to summarize this debate in a couple of ways. What I am hearing is, to paraphrase: We like this policy. We think there is a need. We just want to raise taxes.

Let me put it a different way. If there was a popular spending measure that came here to the floor that extended the same policy from last year to this year because it was expiring, I don't think we would be hearing these concerns.

In fact, with Trade Adjustment Assistance, something that is very popular among this committee and the Members on the other side of the aisle, that is exactly what happened in December. The law expired. A straight extension of the law, of spending, continued. It didn't cost anything. Why? Because that is how the baseline treats spending.

I didn't hear all the hues and cries about deficits when we extended the Trade Adjustment Assistance law, that spending program. So we hear all of these cries about it.

Actually, let me take that back. We don't hear all these hues and cries about the deficits when we extend these tax provisions for 2 years. We don't hear these concerns when we extend current law tax provisions for 1 year. And we don't hear these concerns about deficits when we retroactively extend it from last year, going forward. We only hear these concerns when we are giving people the certainty.

So the real actual question before us is: Do we have to raise taxes on other hardworking Americans just so that we can keep them where they are for everybody else? Do we take money away from charities and people giving donations or raise taxes on other hardworking Americans? Or, just like Trade Adjustment Assistance was extended this last year, do we treat these important provisions the same, which is: they are in the Code; they have been in the Code; we want them in the Code; we agree they should be in the Code—let's keep them in the Code. That is the decision here.

So the newfound concern about deficits, I find, is really more of a thinly veiled attempt to raise taxes. I think what this baseline argument is really all about is: Do we just want to have a Tax Code that raises more and more and more taxes? Do we want to put ourselves in this position of just always raising taxes? Or do we want to give taxpayers a break? We are not even saying give them a break. We are saying, just don't raise their taxes; just keep them where they are.

So this isn't costing anything, in that we are not lowering someone's taxes. We are just keeping their taxes where they are, and we are preventing them from going up. So let's just make it really clear.

I guess the new definition of preventing tax increases from hitting hardworking Americans is now a big tax cut. That is basically what we are hearing here.

We don't buy that logic. We don't want to raise people's taxes. We want to reform the Tax Code. And we want these kinds of provisions that are very important, that we know will stay in the Tax Code even with tax reform. We want people to know that they are there so they can plan accordingly.

We are doing 179 tomorrow. We want farmers to be able to buy tractors before December 11 in the year. We want people to make decisions to donate food to charities. Maybe you are doing well in retirement and you have got a little bit of money out of your Individual Retirement Account and you would like to donate it to a charity, we think you ought to be able to do that. We want foundations to be able to make donations for the greater good in their communities. Those are the things we are getting here and, more importantly, we are giving them the certainty they need to make long-term plans so they can do more of it. That is why we should pass this bill. That is why I think everybody should vote for this bill. That is why I think Democrats and Republicans should vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill.

It's not because I don't support providing additional assistance to benefit charities. I do. It's because this bill is a trick to actually cut funding for groups like food banks and homeless shelters in the long term.

The reason is, the cost of this bill is not paid for, meaning the entire cost of these tax breaks will be added to the nation's deficit.

\$14.2 billion will be added to the deficit.

This after President Obama has already slashed the deficit by $\frac{2}{3}$ from the trillion dollar deficits he inherited from his predecessor George Bush.

So what will be the result of these new larger deficits that my Republican colleagues are creating today?

We all know.

Republicans will soon turn around and cry crocodile tears about the budget and demand deeper cuts in spending.

And that means less Federal grants towards homeless veterans shelters, food banks, senior centers and other organizations that help people in need.

I ask, has the Republican austerity program benefitted charities so far?

Have the budget cuts known as sequestration benefitted local charities and nonprofits?

The answer is a resounding no.

It is the charities themselves who have said the painful budget cuts forced on them have put charities in a situation where more than 50 percent of nonprofits report that they are unable to meet demand for their services.

So why are our charities, our schools, our communities suffering under the Republican majority?

Because my Republican colleagues claimed to be so concerned about deficits—many of

which were caused by the trillion dollar Bush tax cuts that did nothing for our economy or to create jobs—that they have demanded steep spending cuts without ever asking the wealthiest American to pay more.

Yes, my Republican colleagues have used their so-called concerns about the deficit to justify cutting spending to social programs that serve children, seniors, and other vulnerable populations—shifting the burden to already-stressed nonprofits. This is a vicious cycle that needs to stop and it needs to stop today.

Funny thing is we could have stopped this process of adding to the deficit, while still benefiting charities, if the Republicans simply allowed a vote on a Democratic amendment to pay for the costs of these tax cuts.

The Republicans refused to even allow a vote in Congress.

Republicans will argue that tax cuts pay for themselves.

But everyone who has been forced to live under the austerity program over the past few years know otherwise.

Republicans argue there is wasteful spending that needs to be cut in order to mandate new spending. Sometimes they are right.

But let's be clear there are wasteful tax programs out there that should be repealed to pay for more beneficial tax cuts as well.

We can find common ground here.

Let's go back to the drawing board and pass these tax cuts, but in a fiscally responsible manner.

So I reluctantly oppose this bill as it will just add to the deficit and lead to more painful spending cuts for the charitable groups that we are claiming to help today.

I urge a no vote on the underlying bill.

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to highlight an important bill that is being considered by the House today—the “America Gives More Act of 2015 (H.R. 644).” This legislation contains a package of four charitable giving incentives: the IRA charitable rollover; the enhanced deduction for donating food inventory; the simplification of the Private Foundation Excise Tax; and the enhanced deduction for donating conservation easements, the last of which is of critical importance to Montana.

Since 2006, the enhanced tax incentive for qualified conservation easement donations has opened the door to voluntary, landowner-led conservation on millions of acres across the country. This provision allows Montanans, particularly our ranchers and farmers, who donate the development rights on their land to deduct a larger portion of their income over more years. It is common sense that modest income donors with highly valued lands should be allowed the same tax deductions they would have been entitled to if their incomes were larger.

These donations are extraordinary in many ways. One of which is the time they take and the money they cost the donor. Decisions to give away what is often a family's most valuable asset routinely take more than a year and require hiring an attorney and an appraiser at considerable cost. Having this incentive expire after a year guarantees that most of the people who would most benefit from it will never even begin the process of considering it.

I support this bill, especially when it benefits constituents like Dan Lilja. About 35 years ago he moved to rural western Montana after graduating from the University of Montana. He married a local, Sally, and started Lilja Precision Barrels in Plains, Montana, in 1985.

Dan's interest in bench shooting inspired him to design some of the world's best rifle barrels. Lilja barrels are used in rifles by the U.S. Army, the U.S. Army Rangers, Navy SEALs, Coast Guard, the FBI, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and Canadian Special Forces, among others. These customers demand the best and Lilja Precision Barrels delivers a quality product.

Dan and Sally own property in Sanders County along the scenic Clark Fork River. They entered into a conservation easement with the Montana Land Reliance to protect this property from inappropriate subdivision and to provide critical winter and spring habitat for elk and big horn sheep.

In a way that is both patriotic and conservation-minded, Dan and Sally have contributed to the health and preservation of western wildlife habitats and the security of our country. This is just one of the many stories of how conservation easements are preserving our rich heritage, and I call upon the House to support this bill for the betterment of not only Montana, but our country.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Speaker, because I was traveling to attend the President's cybersecurity summit in California, I was not present when the House voted on H.R. 644, the Fighting Hunger Incentive Act of 2015.

While I support goals of the tax provisions in this bill and recognize the value of extending them permanently, I am concerned that H.R. 644 does not pay for them. I have long been a supporter of improving and streamlining charitable donations to make it easier for individuals to donate food, but this one-sided approach of passing bills that offer tax reductions without increasing revenues is unsustainable.

H.R. 644 will add \$14.2 billion to the deficit over 10 years. By bringing this and similar tax extender bills to the floor for votes, Republicans continue to demonstrate that they are not serious about deficit reduction. It is long past time for Congress to have a reasonable and informed debate on comprehensive tax reform. These piecemeal, unbalanced extender votes are not the way to approach real tax reform.

Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about H.R. 644, the America Gives More Act.

The bill before us today contains provisions that I strongly support, but it is with much frustration that I will vote against today's bill. Rather than tackling comprehensive tax reform, House Republicans are once again doing just the opposite. It seems like Congress has given up on comprehensive tax reform only six weeks into the year. The American people deserve better.

I feel like I'm starting to sound like a broken record on this, but we need a tax code that is simple, fair, and provides certainty to all taxpayers. Watching the Republicans cherry pick a few bills while leaving countless other deserving, historically bipartisan bills in the dust is not how to run this committee or this country.

I have been proud to support local food banks in Los Angeles for many years. The work that they do is truly invaluable. Countless families in my district, and across Los Angeles County, are able to put food on the table and send their kids to school on a full stomach because of our local food banks.

Yet year after year we let our local charities down by kicking the can down the road, some-

times kicking the can backwards, when can only muster retroactive policy. Our federal tax code is like a spider web. If we tinker with one provision, others provisions are affected. That is why we must tackle comprehensive tax reform to provide true certainty to both tax payers and charities.

I strongly support the individual charitable provisions before us today, but this is not how to run a country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 101, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. NEAL. I am opposed to the bill in its current form, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves to recommit the bill H.R. 644 to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 7. NO INCREASE IN DEFICIT OR DELAY OF COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

Nothing in this Act shall result in—

(1) an increase in the deficit, or

(2) a delay or weakening of efforts to adopt a permanent extension of the provisions of this Act, so long as it is accomplished in a fiscally responsible manner.

SEC. 8. SHORT-TERM EXTENSION WHILE COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM IS UNDER CONSIDERATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, any temporary provision of law the application of which is otherwise made permanent under this Act shall be hereby only extended for 1 year.

SEC. 9. TAX BENEFITS DISALLOWED IN CASE OF INVERTED CORPORATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a taxpayer which is, or is a member of an expanded affiliated group which includes, an applicable inverted corporation, the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 shall be applied and administered as if the provisions of, and amendments made by, this Act (other than this section) had never been enacted.

(b) APPLICABLE INVERTED CORPORATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term “applicable inverted corporation” means any foreign corporation which—

(A) would be a surrogate foreign corporation under subsection (a)(2) of section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 if such subsection were applied by substituting “80 percent” for “60 percent”, or

(B) is an inverted domestic corporation.

(2) INVERTED DOMESTIC CORPORATION.—For purposes of this subsection, a foreign corporation shall be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if, pursuant to a plan (or a series of related transactions)—

(A) the entity completes after May 8, 2014, the direct or indirect acquisition of—

(i) substantially all of the properties held directly or indirectly by a domestic corporation, or

(ii) substantially all of the assets of, or substantially all of the properties constituting a trade or business of, a domestic partnership, and

(B) after the acquisition, either—

(i) more than 50 percent of the stock (by vote or value) of the entity is held—

(I) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic corporation, by former shareholders of the domestic corporation by reason of holding stock in the domestic corporation, or

(II) in the case of an acquisition with respect to a domestic partnership, by former partners of the domestic partnership by reason of holding a capital or profits interest in the domestic partnership, or

(ii) the management and control of the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity occurs, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States, and such expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities.

(3) EXCEPTION FOR CORPORATIONS WITH SUBSTANTIAL BUSINESS ACTIVITIES IN FOREIGN COUNTRY OF ORGANIZATION.—A foreign corporation described in paragraph (2) shall not be treated as an inverted domestic corporation if after the acquisition the expanded affiliated group which includes the entity has substantial business activities in the foreign country in which or under the law of which the entity is created or organized when compared to the total business activities of such expanded affiliated group. For purposes of applying section 7874(a)(2)(B)(iii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and the preceding sentence, the term “substantial business activities” shall have the meaning given such term under Treasury regulations in effect on May 8, 2014, except that the Secretary of the Treasury may issue regulations increasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute substantial business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

(4) MANAGEMENT AND CONTROL.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii)—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe regulations for purposes of determining cases in which the management and control of an expanded affiliated group is to be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States. The regulations prescribed under the preceding sentence shall apply to periods after May 8, 2014.

(B) EXECUTIVE OFFICERS AND SENIOR MANAGEMENT.—Such regulations shall provide that the management and control of an expanded affiliated group shall be treated as occurring, directly or indirectly, primarily within the United States if substantially all of the executive officers and senior management of the expanded affiliated group who exercise day-to-day responsibility for making decisions involving strategic, financial, and operational policies of the expanded affiliated group are based or primarily located within the United States. Individuals who in fact exercise such day-to-day responsibilities shall be treated as executive officers and senior management regardless of their title.

(5) SIGNIFICANT DOMESTIC BUSINESS ACTIVITIES.—For purposes of paragraph (2)(B)(ii), an expanded affiliated group has significant domestic business activities if at least 25 percent of—

(A) the employees of the group are based in the United States,

(B) the employee compensation incurred by the group is incurred with respect to employees based in the United States,

(C) the assets of the group are located in the United States, or

(D) the income of the group is derived in the United States,

determined in the same manner as such determinations are made for purposes of determining substantial business activities under regulations referred to in paragraph (3) as in effect on May 8, 2014, but applied by treating all references in such regulations to “foreign country” and “relevant foreign country” as references to “the United States”. The Secretary of the Treasury may issue regulations decreasing the threshold percent in any of the tests under such regulations for determining if business activities constitute significant domestic business activities for purposes of this paragraph.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section, the terms “domestic corporation”, “foreign corporation”, and “expanded affiliated group” shall each have the same meaning as when used in section 7874 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill in its current form.

I want to remind my colleagues that this amendment to the bill will not kill the bill or send it back to committee if adopted. It will simply allow us to proceed to final passage, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Chairman RYAN, spoke a few moments ago about the notion of goodwill and confidence. But he used a peculiar term as a substitute. He called it the “baseline.”

What about a baseline of some goodwill and confidence building and a measure that acknowledged that, in terms of procedure, this is a violation of the confidence that we have all tried to establish as we proceed to tax reform?

Some of us who have been around for a long time and have participated in actual tax strategy, we would offer the following: the last time that the Tax Code was changed in America, the Internet had not been invented, Ronald Reagan was the President of the United States, and Tip O'Neill was the Speaker of this House.

Now, in terms of procedure, why we object is the following: if you recall, the gentleman from Michigan, Chairman Camp, waited until tax reform last year was completely dead and then asked us to go through the motion. And that, in the end, is exactly what it was, to have gone through the motion of trying to pass some permanent extended tax bills.

Well, in New England 2 weeks ago, we were talking about deflated footballs. Now we are talking about deflated tax reform expectations.

Six weeks into this Congress, and we are doing this procedural instead of

substantive achievement that might lead to some tax relief, as the President has acknowledged, for American corporations or tax relief for individual and family filers?

□ 1630

We are doing this with the argument that, somehow, Democrats don't support charitable giving? Our objection today is based on the following: Fiscally, this is reckless; procedurally, it violates the notion of goodwill in the House; and lastly, and just as importantly, I think it pushes apart the two parties from getting to tax reform.

Mr. Speaker, this is a positioning amendment: How might we embarrass the minority? Do you know what? They are saying here, as they go forward in this argument, that this keeps everything the way it is, it extends charitable giving.

You have to borrow the money eventually to pay for this. That adds to the deficits. Mr. Speaker, that is the argument that we are having here today. We want to know how this is paid for. We are not objecting to the thrust or mission of what is being offered. Under different circumstances, these bills would pass without any problem with broad support.

Mr. Speaker, I don't have any personal quarrel with the merits of this policy, but when it is unpaid for, it means more borrowing. We all support the work of public charities and private foundations in our communities. We support the good works of charitable communities, and we strive to provide these charities with the resources that they need to carry out their mission.

Let me ask you this: Why would they try to masquerade this notion that somebody from Massachusetts is against charitable giving?

Universities, hospitals, and foundations, they abound throughout my State. Like the rest of our Caucus, I favor charitable giving and object to the procedure in which this is being offered today. We object to the procedure.

Why are we taking up this time debating these bills? We should be coming together on tax reform, as promised, for middle class families that grows the economy. If the goal of Mr. RYAN is to eventually remove all deductions, preferences, and exclusions in the Code to get to a lower rate, that should be stated, but not to do it this way.

We are debating bills that the administration has already said they will veto and the Senate has given us no indication they will take them up.

So to fix this moment, our motion to recommit offers the following: a 1-year bridge to tax reform. By the way, my predictions of this in terms of the extenders have been far more accurate over the years than their proposals on the extenders.

We are suggesting here a proposal that does not add to the deficit and ad-

resses the longstanding problem of corporate inversions. By the way, why are companies inverting? Because of the tax system in America.

We are suggesting today that there is a difference and a distinction to be drawn between tax evasion and tax avoidance. They are avoiding taxes in some cases and evading them in the others.

We have an opportunity to do something about this Tax Code that would help bring that about. We pay for our provision. It gives, I think, a measure of comfort for the Democratic minority today to vote for this motion to recommit, and I urge Republican support for this provision.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. I withdraw my reservation of a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The reservation of the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief. My friend got a little animated.

Mr. Speaker, there was a lot there. I will just say this. Here is the question before us: Do we want to give businesses and charities certainty or not? If we would pass this motion to recommit and it went into law, then we will be right back here at the end of the year with the same old problem. We will be right back here. We will be right back here in the same old problem.

They are saying, Let's just do 1 year. Let's just say it takes a few months to pass through the Senate and all of this, then we are back here at the end of the year saying, Oh, my gosh, all these charities are going to be in jeopardy in January.

Let's get off this merry-go-round, Mr. Speaker. It is ridiculous. We all know this is good policy. We all know this is the right thing to do, and we all know that businesses and charities need the kind of certainty that we are providing, and most of us believe that not raising taxes is not the same as cutting taxes.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum

time for any electronic vote on the question of passage of the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 168, nays 245, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—168

Adams	Gabbard	Napolitano
Aguilar	Gallego	Neal
Ashford	Garamendi	Nolan
Bass	Graham	Norcross
Beatty	Grayson	Pallone
Bera	Green, Al	Pascrell
Beyer	Green, Gene	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Grijalva	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Hahn	Peters
Boyle (PA)	Hastings	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Polis
Bustos	Hoyer	Quigley
Butterfield	Huffman	Rangel
Capps	Israel	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Cardenas	Jeffries	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Keating	Sánchez, Linda
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	T.
Chu (CA)	Kennedy	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Cleaver	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lawrence	Sherman
Cooper	Levin	Sinema
Costa	Lewis	Sires
Courtney	Lieu (CA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Loeb sack	Takai
Cummings	Lowenthal	Takano
Davis (CA)	Lowey	Thompson (MS)
Davis, Danny	Lujan Grisham	Titus
DeFazio	(NM)	Tonko
DeGette	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Delaney	(NM)	Tsongas
DelBene	Lynch	Van Hollen
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Vargas
Deutch	Carolyn	Vela
Dingell	Maloney, Sean	Velázquez
Doyle (PA)	Matsui	Visclosky
Edwards	McCollum	Walz
Ellison	McDermott	Wasserman
Engel	McGovern	Schultz
Esty	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Farr	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Fattah	Meng	Welch
Foster	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Yarmuth
Fudge	Nadler	

NAYS—245

Abraham	Calvert	Duncan (TN)
Aderholt	Carter (GA)	Ellmers
Allen	Carter (TX)	Emmer
Amash	Chabot	Farenthold
Amodei	Chaffetz	Fincher
Babin	Clawson (FL)	Fitzpatrick
Barletta	Coffman	Fleischmann
Barr	Cole	Fleming
Barton	Collins (GA)	Flores
Becerra	Collins (NY)	Forbes
Benishek	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bilirakis	Conaway	Foxx
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Black	Cramer	Garrett
Blackburn	Crawford	Gibbs
Blum	Crenshaw	Gibson
Bost	Culberson	Gohmert
Boustany	Curbelo (FL)	Goodlatte
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Gosar
Brat	Denham	Gowdy
Bridenstine	Dent	Granger
Brooks (AL)	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	DesJarlais	Graves (LA)
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Graves (MO)
Buck	Doggett	Griffith
Bucshon	Dold	Grothman
Burgess	Duffy	Guinta
Byrne	Duncan (SC)	Guthrie

Hanna	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Hardy	McKinley	Salmon
Harper	McMorris	Sanford
Harris	Rodgers	Scalise
Hartzler	McSally	Schock
Heck (NV)	Meadows	Schweikert
Hensarling	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Hice (GA)	Mica	Sessions
Hill	Miller (FL)	Shimkus
Holding	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Hudson	Moolenaar	Simpson
Huelskamp	Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)
Huizenga (MI)	Mullin	Smith (NE)
Hultgren	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Hunter	Neugebauer	Smith (TX)
Hurd (TX)	Newhouse	Stefanik
Hurt (VA)	Noem	Stewart
Issa	Nugent	Stivers
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Stutzman
Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke	Thompson (CA)
Johnson (OH)	Olson	Thompson (PA)
Johnson, Sam	Palazzo	Thornberry
Jolly	Palmer	Tiberi
Jones	Paulsen	Tipton
Jordan	Perry	Trott
Joyce	Pittenger	Turner
Katko	Pitts	Upton
Kelly (PA)	Poe (TX)	Valadao
King (IA)	Poliquin	Wagner
King (NY)	Pompeo	Walberg
Kinzinger (IL)	Posey	Walden
Kline	Price (GA)	Walker
Knight	Ratcliffe	Walorski
Labrador	Reed	Walters, Mimi
LaMalfa	Reichert	Weber (TX)
Lamborn	Renacci	Webster (FL)
Lance	Ribble	Wenstrup
Latta	Rice (SC)	Westerman
LoBiondo	Rigell	Westmoreland
Long	Roby	Whitfield
Loudermilk	Rogers (AL)	Williams
Love	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
Lucas	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Luetkemeyer	Rokita	Womack
Lummis	Rooney (FL)	Woodall
MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen	Yoder
Marchant	Roskam	Yoho
Marino	Ross	Young (AK)
Massie	Rothfus	Young (IA)
McCarthy	Rouzer	Young (IN)
McCaul	Royce	Zeldin
McClintock	Russell	Zinke

NOT VOTING—19

Cartwright	Lee	Ruiz
DeLauro	Lofgren	Rush
Duckworth	Mulvaney	Speier
Eshoo	Murphy (FL)	Swalwell (CA)
Hinojosa	Pearce	Veasey
Honda	Price (NC)	
Kaptur	Roe (TN)	

□ 1659

Messrs. **LOUDERMILK, WESTERMAN, LATTA, GRIFFITH, BILIRAKIS,** and **AMODEI** changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. COHEN and Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 279, nays 137, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—279

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Perlmutter
Aguilar	Graves (MO)	Perry
Allen	Grayson	Peters
Amash	Griffith	Peterson
Amodei	Grothman	Pittenger
Ashford	Guinta	Pitts
Babin	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Barletta	Hahn	Poliquin
Barr	Hanna	Pompeo
Barton	Hardy	Posey
Benishek	Harper	Price (GA)
Bera	Harris	Quigley
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Bishop (GA)	Heck (NV)	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Heck (WA)	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Renacci
Black	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Blackburn	Hice (GA)	Rice (NY)
Blum	Hill	Rice (SC)
Bost	Holding	Rigell
Boustany	Hudson	Roby
Boyle (PA)	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brat	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Bridenstine	Hunter	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Hurd (TX)	Rooney (FL)
Brooks (IN)	Hurt (VA)	Ros-Lehtinen
Brownley (CA)	Issa	Roskam
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Bustos	Jolly	Ruppersberger
Byrne	Jordan	Russell
Calvert	Joyce	Ryan (WI)
Capps	Katko	Salmon
Carter (GA)	Keating	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Kelly (PA)	Scalise
Castro (TX)	Kilmer	Schock
Chabot	King (IA)	Schweikert
Chaffetz	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Clawson (FL)	Kinzinger (IL)	Sensenbrenner
Clawson (UT)	Kirkpatrick	Sessions
Coffman	Kline	Shimkus
Cole	Knight	Shuster
Collins (GA)	Kuster	Simpson
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Sinema
Comstock	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Conaway	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Cook	Lance	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	Latta	Smith (TX)
Cramer	Lipinski	Stefanik
Crawford	LoBiondo	Stewart
Crenshaw	Loeb sack	Stivers
Cuellar	Long	Stutzman
Culberson	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	Love	Thornberry
Davis, Rodney	Lucas	Tiberi
Delaney	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
DelBene	Lummis	Titus
Denham	MacArthur	Trott
Dent	Maloney, Sean	Turner
DeSantis	Marchant	Upton
DesJarlais	Marino	Valadao
Dingell	Massie	Vargas
Diaz-Balart	McCarthy	Vela
Dold	McCaul	Wagner
Duffy	McClintock	Walberg
Duncan (SC)	McHenry	Walden
Duncan (TN)	McKinley	Walker
Ellmers	McMorris	Walorski
Emmer	Rodgers	Walters, Mimi
Esty	McSally	Walz
Farenthold	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Fincher	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Messer	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	Mica	Westerman
Fleming	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Flores	Miller (MI)	Whitfield
Forbes	Moolenaar	Williams
Fortenberry	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Mullin	Wittman
Franks (AZ)	Murphy (FL)	Womack
Frelinghuysen	Murphy (PA)	Woodall
Garamendi	Neugebauer	Yoder
Garrett	Newhouse	Yoho
Gibbs	Noem	Young (AK)
Gibson	Nolan	Young (IA)
Gohmert	Nugent	Young (IN)
Goodlatte	Nunes	Zeldin
Gosar	Olson	Zinke
Gowdy	Palazzo	
Graham	Palmer	
Granger		

NAYS—137

Adams	Green, Al	O'Rourke
Bass	Green, Gene	Pallone
Beatty	Grijalva	Pascarell
Becerra	Gutiérrez	Payne
Beyer	Hastings	Pelosi
Blumenauer	Higgins	Pingree
Bonamici	Himes	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Polis
Brown (FL)	Huffman	Rangel
Butterfield	Israel	Richmond
Capuano	Jackson Lee	Roybal-Allard
Cardenas	Jeffries	Rush
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez, Linda
Castor (FL)	Jones	T.
Chu (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Sanchez, Loretta
Cicilline	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Langevin	Schrader
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Scott, David
Cohen	Lawrence	Serrano
Connolly	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lewis	Sherman
Cooper	Lieu (CA)	Sires
Costa	Lowenthal	Slaughter
Courtney	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lujan Grisham	Takai
Cummings	(NM)	Takano
Davis (CA)	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	(NM)	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lynch	Tonko
DeGette	Maloney,	Torres
DeSaulnier	Carolyn	Tsongas
Dingell	Matsui	Van Hollen
Doggett	McCollum	Veasey
Doyle (PA)	McDermott	Velázquez
Edwards	McGovern	Visclosky
Ellison	McNerney	Wasserman
Engel	Meeks	Schultz
Farr	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Fattah	Moore	Watson Coleman
Foster	Moulton	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Napolitano	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Neal	
Gallego	Norcross	

NOT VOTING—16

Cartwright	Kaptur	Roe (TN)
DeLauro	Lee	Ruiz
Duckworth	Lofgren	Speier
Eshoo	Mulvaney	Swalwell (CA)
Hinojosa	Pearce	
Honda	Price (NC)	

□ 1707

Mr. CARSON of Indiana changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1715

HONORING WALTER GROTZ ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

(Mr. EMMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the 90th birthday of Walter Grotz of Delano, Minnesota.

Born on February 10, 1925, Walter is a World War II veteran with a remarkable life of service, both to his community and to his country.

Shortly after graduating from Delano High School in 1943, Walter was drafted into the U.S. Army Air Force. When his plane was shot down over Germany, he spent 6 months as a prisoner of war of the Nazis.

After surviving this brutal experience, Walter came back to Minnesota, serving as Delano's postmaster until his retirement 34 years later. “Freedom is a very special thing,” he reminds Delano students through his scholarship essay contest. “You take it for granted because it's always been there and always will be.” But will it?

Thank you for your service, Walter. Happy birthday.

SEND THE PRESIDENT A HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has 5 legislative days left until February 27. We have 5 days to meet and send the President an appropriations bill that he can sign to keep the Department of Homeland Security from shutting down.

The Republican leader in the Senate says the House ought to act. The Speaker says the Senate ought to act. Somebody needs to act. Somebody needs to act like an adult. Somebody needs to fund the security and safety of the American people. Their own Senate colleagues disagree with their strategy of holding national security hostage to their political goals on immigration.

We face, as all of us know, very real threats, which is why we cannot let the Department's funding lapse. If Republicans want to debate immigration policy, then bring an immigration bill to the floor. Don't hold our security hostage.

I ask my Republican colleagues to end their games and instead work with us to keep America safe.

NATIONAL MARRIAGE WEEK

(Mr. HUELSKAMP asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HUELSKAMP. Mr. Speaker, this week marks National Marriage Week. This is the time for Americans to recognize, to celebrate, to honor this time-honored institution and the critical importance of a man and a woman committing to each other and to the children of their loving union.

The plain and simple truth is this: marriage is vital to our economic success, cultural well-being, and our children. And sadly, it is being trampled upon as we speak. Unelected judges from all across the country are forcing their personal feelings and biases against traditional marriage upon the American people. This judicial activism has thrown the social and legal status of marriage into chaos.

Since the question of marriage is now before the U.S. Supreme Court, Congress must act now to right this wrong. That is why today I am reintroducing the marriage protection amendment to

affirm the true meaning of marriage is between one man and one woman and to provide a clear policy for our Nation, especially for our children.

ANNIVERSARY OF CRASH OF FLIGHT 3407

(Mr. HIGGINS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, today marks the sixth anniversary of the crash of Colgan Air Flight 3407 in western New York, which forever stole the lives of husbands and wives, sons and daughters, sisters and brothers.

Since that tragic day, the families and friends of those taken banded together as a new family to give others what their loved ones didn't have: a safe flight home. They descended in red by the dozens on Capitol Hill, turning pain into persistence, purpose, and progress.

They saw success in the passage of the Airline Safety and Federal Aviation Administration Extension Act, which establishes the “one level of safety” standard. This ensures that all commercial airlines, regardless of size, are held to the same high-quality training and rest requirements.

Still, there is no rest for the brave families. Last week, I joined them on Capitol Hill to support reauthorization of the Federal Aviation Administration bill and to speak out against recent industry pushback on safety qualifications.

With heavy hearts we remember the people of Flight 3407 and their courageous families. The flying public is safer today because of their work and persistence.

AMERICAN HEART MONTH

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remind every American that February is Heart Month.

According to the American Heart Association, heart disease is the most common form of mortality among both men and women. In fact, one out of every four deaths in this country is cardiac-related. And yet many of these deaths are preventable.

Small changes in diet and exercise can have an enormous and positive impact on your heart health and lifespan. We must not forget America's amazing medical researchers and practitioners who are also doing their part by pioneering innovative treatments that save lives every day.

So, please remember to love your heart this Valentine's Day, and every day.

SUPPORT PRESIDENT'S DECISION TO DEFER ON DEPORTATION

(Mr. SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the President's decision to defer the deportation of some of the 11 million undocumented immigrants who are in this country.

This is a decision that every President has made, to one degree or another. We do not have the resources to deport everybody, so he makes a decision about which ones should go and shouldn't. There is nothing illegal about that, and the House should not be holding up the Department of Homeland Security Appropriations bill because of that policy issue.

First of all, it is a policy issue best addressed by a policy committee, not by holding hostage an appropriations bill. There is an authorizing process to go through to have that fight. Secondly, and more importantly, the President's decision was the right one. There are millions upon millions of undocumented immigrants in this country who are valuable members of our community. They are wives and husbands. They are fathers. They are working productively and paying taxes. Tearing apart families and communities is not something that is going to help this country.

I think the President made the right decision. We should support it. And we certainly shouldn't be shutting down the Department of Homeland Security in a misguided attempt to go after that policy.

ENHANCE MILITARY SUPPORT FOR THE KURDS

(Mr. FORTENBERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Speaker, the international campaign to defeat ISIL depends in great part on the strength and effectiveness of trusted partners in the Middle East—trusted partners such as the Kurds.

The Kurdish Peshmerga is a moderate and capable force. They are showing determined courage in fighting ISIL, and they are winning a number of strategic victories. The Kurds are also defending the values of tolerance and pluralism, sheltering hundreds of thousands of Christians, Yazidis, and innocent Muslim people who have fled ISIL's onslaught. They deserve robust support.

Driven by a twisted form of Islam, ISIL's militants are eighth century barbarians using 21st century weaponry. The recent videotaped immolation of a caged Jordanian pilot is a horrific reminder of their brutality. They are now responsible for the deaths of four American hostages, including Kayla Mueller, a 26-year-old humanitarian worker who was captured while assisting refugees in Syria.

Confronted by such acts, the United States, Sunni Arab nations, and key al-

lies, including Germany, France, and Britain, should enhance military support for the Kurds.

HONORING THE LIFE OF AL LEWIS

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor today to honor the life of Al Lewis, a selfless and larger-than-life community leader who truly embodied the aloha spirit of my home State of Hawaii. He was a husband, father, friend, organizer, mentor, and so much more to so many. If you knew Waimanalo, his hometown, you also knew "Uncle Al."

He found his passion helping those in need and led through servant leadership, never too busy or too preoccupied with himself to take action to better the lives of those around him. He helped our children—keiki—succeed by working with youth groups like the Waimanalo Teen Project.

In founding the Friends of Waimanalo, he helped create a literary program, purchased uniforms for schoolchildren, and donated to Kailua High School. Every single year he brought the community together from all parts at the Waimanalo Community Carnival.

A respected and loyal community advocate, Al Lewis, better known as Uncle Al, will be remembered and missed by his friends, family, and Hawaii.

PASS THE HOMELAND SECURITY APPROPRIATIONS BILL

(Mr. AGUILAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today, once again, we find ourselves on the verge of a shutdown—because Congress can't do its job and pass funding for the Department of Homeland Security.

Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, the Senate passed a bipartisan comprehensive immigration reform plan—a commonsense plan—that the House failed to pass. The House has failed to pass anything to address immigration reform, forcing the President to act.

And now, Congress is playing politics, trying to roll back the President's reforms and threatening to force the American people to pay the price for Congress' inability to agree on funding to protect our homeland.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot risk American jobs, lives, and the national security of the United States. We need to pass the Homeland Security Appropriations bill. We face many threats around the world. We cannot play games here.

To my colleagues I ask you: Is it more important to score political points, or is it more important to safeguard our national security?

Mr. Speaker, I am urging you today to bring a clean appropriations bill to the floor so we can fully fund the De-

partment of Homeland Security. I urge my colleagues to join this effort.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS: INFRASTRUCTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALKER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, which is having our Special Order hour today to talk about the Nation's need for infrastructure—the fact that we need to keep serious investments in infrastructure not only to keep our roads and bridges and other important parts of our country together but also to help the good, family-supporting jobs that come along with these important investments in our infrastructure.

I serve on the Budget Committee, and we were talking one day with Dr. Elmendorf from the Congressional Budget Office, our nonpartisan agency that we deal with to talk about budgetary matters.

Specifically, I asked the question of Dr. Elmendorf about the Recovery Act that we passed in this country a number of years ago. Dr. Elmendorf said that, thanks to that Recovery Act, over 3 million jobs were saved or created because of the investment we put into our Nation's infrastructure.

In my State of Wisconsin, I was at the State legislature at the time and I chaired our budget committee. We had a report from the road building industry and the vertical construction industry that said 54,000 jobs just in Wisconsin were saved or created because of the Recovery Act.

As much as that helped provide a boost to the economy and help fill our infrastructure needs, we still have so many more to take care of. We have been given a grade of D-plus by the very engineering society that grades our Nation's infrastructure. We have been told that we have 100,000 bridges in this country, or 16 percent, old enough that they can qualify for Medicare.

□ 1730

As we know from recent disasters that we have seen in different parts of the country where bridges have fallen and people have literally been killed, we need to reinvest in that infrastructure so that we have a country that operates, that businesses can function.

Also, we need to help create those jobs now for people who are still out of work. As the economy is coming back, we know that wages have been stagnant, and these are good, strong, family-supporting jobs that can provide it.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus will soon be putting out our version of the budget, just as we will among the Democrats and the Republicans, but we will put out our version

of the budget—just as the President has—with a deep investment in our infrastructure needs because we know that that investment is one of the pillars of the strong economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

CONGRESSIONAL PROGRESSIVE CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank my colleague, Mr. POCAN, for yielding back and giving me this opportunity to address the people of the United States of America.

I am new around here, and so I like to generally listen and evaluate before I speak, and I only try to speak when I might have something to add of value.

If you drive through my district, which is the 12th Congressional District of the State of New Jersey and includes a lot of highways, byways, and bridges, you will see this iconic sign in the capital of New Jersey that says, "Trenton Makes, The World Takes."

It is a sign that points out the legendary industrial past of our community. However, this industrial revolution, it has passed us by, and it is a reminder of the employment that the city used to have.

Yes, the city of Trenton was once the place that you found employment. The Trenton Iron Company produced the wrought iron beams for the dome on this U.S. Capitol Building where we stand today. Trenton's John Roebling's Sons Company produced wire rope that was used to build the Brooklyn Bridge, the now-famous George Washington Bridge, and the Golden Gate suspension bridge in California.

Trenton was also known for its pottery-making, and even today, Trenton pottery can be found on display in museums around the world because of its artistry and superior craftsmanship.

Trenton's booming industry is responsible for the invention of even the oyster crackers, pork roll, Bayer aspirin, and felt-tipped markers.

Yet, today, Trenton, New Jersey, has a 15 percent unemployment rate. The city of Trenton's legendary industrial past does little for the thousands of unemployed workers searching for work today. The city has had a turn for the worse since the manufacturing sector has left and took with it great-paying jobs.

We are not alone in that problem and this crisis. The same can be said for Cleveland, Ohio, or Detroit, Michigan, or Gary, Indiana, or Philadelphia—to name just a few—towns which were once thriving centers of commerce where jobs were plentiful and unem-

ployment was rare. Today, these same towns face an unemployment crisis where securing work that enables a mother or a father to support a family is an elusive proposition.

At the same time we experience this employment crisis, we also have a crisis in our infrastructure. New Jersey has 39,213 total miles of road. We are small, but we have a lot of concrete, but 35 percent of the major roads are in deprived condition.

New Jersey has 6,566 bridges, but 36 percent of which are underfunded, considered structurally deficient, or functionally obsolete. Over 200 million trips are taken daily across deficient bridges in the Nation, but in total, one in nine of the Nation's bridges are rated as structurally deficient.

You may recall, in 2007, the I-35W Mississippi River bridge in Minneapolis—which had been categorized as structurally deficient—collapsed, killing 13 and injuring 145 people.

Mr. Speaker, our bridges are crumbling, and we need to invest in building and fixing them. The Nation's estimated 100,000 miles of levees can be found in all 50 States and the District of Columbia. The reliability of these levees is unknown in many cases, and the country has yet to establish a national levee safety program.

In 2005, New Orleans' levees failed to hold back the floodwaters of Hurricane Katrina, claiming the lives of more than 1,800 people and causing at least \$125 billion in economic damage. Public safety remains at risk from these aging structures, and the cost to repair or rehabilitate these levees is roughly estimated to be \$100 billion by the National Committee on Levee Safety.

Mr. Speaker, these numbers are reflective of what America has become. I take a look at our communities today, and I see the vestiges of our past.

I ask that we, as Congress, stop playing games, that we get to work for real this time, that we recognize that here we will have the opportunity to not only create safe infrastructure, not only to create safe bridges, not only to protect communities that are subject to flooding from levees, but we will also be able to create jobs.

There is no more meaningful social action program than a good job, and we know that government has a history for creating those jobs in times of need that help not only to build the strong infrastructure of this great Nation, but to put families back to work, to make sure that they are earning a wage for which they can take care of their children, help provide opportunities for their families, take care of their elderly, ensure that their children have access to quality education, and ensure that our future is strong and stable, based upon the fact that they have had good, predictable, dependable, decent-paying jobs with decent wages.

I look to our Congress, as many people do in this country, and I know who we really are, and I know that if we put our foot to the pedal, that if we decide

that we are going to put this country back on a strong footing—metaphorically, as well as literally—I know that if we are understanding that if we build out and support that middle-income layer, those people, the working people of this Nation, that we will create an economy that will grow and prosper everyone from the very, very top to the very, very bottom.

That is what we need to do right now in this country, from a bipartisan perspective, is to introduce, to advocate for, to debate, discuss, design, and develop an infrastructure bill with bipartisan support that signals to the working families and all families in this country that, A, we want to make sure that you are safe as you travel our highways and cross our bridges, that you are safe when you live near waterways and need to be protected with levees, and that you are given the opportunity to give back to your country, to build it, make it the strong country that it should be and, at the same time, create the kind of jobs that we need in order to grow our economy for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to speak to the American people today, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE LEGACY OF THE HONORABLE SAM JOHNSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 42 years ago today, a POW came home from Vietnam.

This Special Order was put on by Mr. DOLD from Illinois. He will be here shortly.

A man I love came home that day 42 years ago. He is our colleague, SAM JOHNSON. SAM first saw combat in Korea, 62 hair-raising combat missions in an F-86 Sabre. He told me he used to race Buzz Aldrin to get to where the bad guys were to get the first kill of the day. That same Buzz Aldrin walked on the moon with Neil Armstrong.

SAM shot down one MIG in Korea. He came home and quickly became one of our best pilots in the Air Force. He joined the Thunderbirds, the Air Force's flight demonstration team. He flew solo and slot in the F-100C Super Sabre. He became an instructor pilot at the Air Force's Fighter Weapons School, their Top Gun.

SAM saw combat again in Vietnam. He flew the F-4 Phantom into combat. Coming back after dropping his bombs on North Korea, he was shot down. It was his 25th combat mission over Vietnam, April 15, 1966. SAM bailed out and fell into hell on earth. He was taken prisoner, confined for 6 years, 9 months, and 12 days.

This was a new war for POWs. It was a war of propaganda, so every minute

those men were alive, they were valuable. Their captors used starvation, disease, isolation, physical, and mental torture to push these men to confess to war crimes, to bombing hospitals and schools with napalm. They were beaten every single day they were held in captivity.

The Viet Cong saw a fighter in SAM JOHNSON. They saw a man who might start a riot, a rebellion. They called him a "diehard," and so—with 10 other men—they moved him from the Hanoi Hilton to a place they called Alcatraz, hell within hell.

SAM was alone for over 2 years. He stayed in a windowless concrete room, 9 feet wide, 4 feet, 9 by 4 feet. Every summer, it got up to 110 degrees Fahrenheit in his cell.

His legs were shackled with irons—both legs—every minute he was in his cell. Ten other men went with him: Jeremiah Denton, Jim Stockdale, Bob Shumaker, Ronald Storz, Harry Jenkins, Howard Rutledge, Nels Tanner, Jim Mulligan, George McKnight, and George Coker.

□ 1745

Ten came home. Ronald Storz died in Alcatraz in captivity. SAM and his 10 brothers all learned to lean on each other to survive. In Alcatraz, one day SAM was put in a cell and beaten and beaten and beaten to make him write a document and sign his confession of committing a war crime.

Jeremiah Denton heard the clamor when SAM was thrown back into his cell hours after he was taken off from his cell with the Viet Cong. Admiral Denton said: SAM, SAM, it is okay, buddy. There was silence for a couple moments, and then SAM said: I made them write it, but I had to sign it. Admiral Denton said: It is okay, SAM. You are, okay. Hang on. You did a good job.

Because of what SAM and others went through, every naval aviator, marine aviator, Air Force pilot, Army pilot, Navy SEAL, Marine Force Recon, Army Green Berets attend what is known as SERE school—S-E-R-E, survive, evade, resist, escape—POW school.

I went to SERE for 1 week in the fall of 1991. I was fed little amounts of food. No sleep. The last 2 days were in the POW camp in a small concrete room like SAM, alone, stuffed into a small box in the dark, loud music and a waterboard. That training gave me a taste of torture—my strengths and weaknesses. SAM never had that training. He learned it with his blood and broken bones.

I want to close by using the tap code, the way SAM and his fellow prisoners used to communicate without talking. It is a 5 by 5 matrix, 25 letters. It omits the K.

(Tapping on podium.)

In the Hanoi Hilton and Alcatraz, that says: I salute you. SAM, if I was there that day, 42 years ago when you came home, I would say: SAM, I salute you.

God bless them all.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE 42ND ANNIVERSARY OF THE RELEASE OF AMERICAN POWS FROM VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend from Texas for his remarks talking about SAM JOHNSON, one of the great American heroes that we have the honor here of serving with. That tap code that you just heard was really the lifeline, the lifeline for so many of the almost 600 POWs, the vast majority in the Hoa Lo Prison. So while you heard those taps, those taps were actually the communication system that allowed those POWs to have some sort of contact with another human, and, I would argue, probably saved many lives.

Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield to my good friend from Kentucky.

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DOLD), my friend, for his leadership on this issue and for leading this special hour. I also want to thank my friend from Texas for honoring our colleague SAM JOHNSON, a true American hero who, through his service and sacrifice, his time in the Hanoi Hilton, his time as a prisoner of war in Vietnam, really showcased what it means to be a great patriot and an American hero willing to sacrifice for his fellow countrymen and for the freedom that we all enjoy.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of central and eastern Kentucky, I, too, rise today to recognize the 42nd anniversary of the release of American prisoners of war from Vietnam. I would like to honor the brave men and women who courageously wore our Nation's cloth and made great sacrifices in the name of freedom.

As I walk into my congressional office, I am reminded every day of all the American servicemembers that never returned home from past wars by the POW flag that I proudly display outside of my office.

Since the beginning of the Revolutionary War, Kentuckians have continued to answer our Nation's call to service. In fact, over 125,000 Kentuckians courageously and unselfishly served during the Vietnam era, and the people of Kentucky honor those who fought and died in Vietnam by commissioning the Kentucky Vietnam Veterans Memorial, which overlooks Kentucky's beautiful State capitol building in Frankfort. I would also like to recognize the organizations that keep the memories of those who have sacrificed much for our country alive, organizations such as Task Force Omega of Kentucky, Rolling Thunder, and the

Kentucky Patriot Guard, who constantly remind us to never forget the servicemembers who have perished and have not yet returned home from Vietnam and other wars fought on foreign soil.

While being held captive, American POWs found strength in each other, and as Congressman DOLD and Congressman OLSON pointed out, those taps were the way that those men in that prison kept each other's spirits alive. Through their struggle, they found resilience; through their faith, they found comfort; and through their patriotism, they found hope. We are so grateful to have these servicemembers home. As we know all too well from recent events in the Middle East, not all prisoners of war make it back to their family members alive, but we owe all of them a debt of gratitude.

Unlike the veterans of World War II, Iraq, the Persian Gulf war or Afghanistan, those who served in Vietnam had a very different and unfortunate experience, many of them, when they returned home. Some were advised to change into civilian clothes and avoid contact with protestors, and it really hurt. They didn't deserve it. They deserve better. So for all of those veterans of the Vietnam war, including those who were POWs, we welcome them home because they deserve our respect, and they deserve to be welcomed home to a grateful nation.

American servicemembers found hope in the fact that a grateful nation would not leave them behind and would do everything possible to bring them home. We, as Americans, still stand behind that promise today.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for the opportunity to honor the 42nd anniversary of the release of American POWs from Vietnam.

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for coming and joining us in honoring these really incredible servicemen, each with an incredible story, and really as we talk about it, actually, Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor yesterday. Yesterday I came to this very spot to talk about my uncle. My uncle is one of the Alcatraz 11, lives not far from the Capitol here in Washington. He was flying off the USS *Coral Sea* in an F-8 Crusader and was shot down on a low-level mission, flying about a thousand feet above the ground.

Now, for those, Mr. Speaker, that don't know what an F-8 Crusader is, it is a jet that can fly at Mach 1.72, nearly twice the speed of sound. When it filled up with smoke after he was hit, he had very little time to eject. He ejected. His parachute opened about 35 feet above the ground, and he broke his back on impact.

Now, this is an incredible story. Yesterday marked the 50th anniversary of being shot down. That was one of the darkest days, I would argue, certainly in our family; but for American servicemen, and certainly aviators, that is certainly a very dark day.

Today, February 12, marks a very different day, a day for us to rejoice because it was the day that marks Operation Homecoming, the day that over 600 American POWs would eventually be released, and February 12 was the day that those first POWs would be released from the Hoa Lo Prison.

The Hoa Lo Prison, Mr. Speaker, was a prison that was built by the French, and unspeakable things happened at this prison. What is incredible to me is not the darkness of what happened at the Hoa Lo Prison, a prison that we know today as the Hanoi Hilton. What is remarkable to me is the fact that these servicemen relied upon faith and honor to get them through, and largely each other.

So I just want those that may be tuning in to put themselves in the place of an American aviator, jumping on board a jet. Put yourself, perhaps, in the cockpit of that F-8 Crusader.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not revealing any news when we talk about American servicemen and -women being a little bit cocky if they are out there flying. I think some might think they are invincible. Well, the world changed certainly for my uncle and for many on the day of their captivity. They no longer had their aircraft. They no longer had their sidearm. They no longer had their uniform. All was stripped from them. They were issued, in essence, a pair of pajamas and a pair of sandals.

Little did my uncle or SAM JOHNSON or Nels Tanner or Jim Stockdale or Jeremiah Denton or JOHN MCCAIN or many of the other POWs realize how long this conflict would continue. What they did know was that each and every one of them, as an American fighting man, was going to return home with honor.

Many of you may know, Mr. Speaker, the story of JOHN MCCAIN. His father was very high up in the United States Navy. The Vietnamese knew that they had a prize when they had JOHN MCCAIN, and he was offered early release. They were going to give him a free pass home and comfort to be back here in the United States. The devastation that would have done to the POWs, the morale would have been devastating, and so he turned them down. The Vietnamese said it was going to be very bad for you now, Mr. MCCAIN, and indeed it was. He, as well as the other Americans in captivity, would endure years of torture.

□ 1800

The big four, Mr. Speaker, was name, rank, serial number, and date of birth. And these men would be tortured for additional information. Every person—at least everyone that I know—has their breaking point, and certainly American POWs are no different.

They set up a system. They set up, in essence, a military operation, following rank. Jim Stockdale was the highest-ranking officer and, therefore, sent word out that if they were broken,

to be able to stiffen their back up and give no additional information next time.

That tap code system that you heard the gentleman from Texas talk about, the 5 by 5 matrix, A-B-C-D-E-F-G-H-I-J—they eliminated the K because they needed to have a 5 by 5 matrix. Rows and columns—first the row, then the column. So B is first row, second column. And really, the way they did it is, “shave and a haircut, two bits” is how you started this conversation. So most Americans know that if you give the rap, they are going to respond with two taps. And that is when you knew there was an American on the other side of the wall. If they got any sort of a different response, they knew that it was most likely not an American and, therefore, they were going to stop their communication.

What was going on through those walls was literally like hundreds of woodpeckers going nonstop, day in and day out, letting people know that it was okay, that they had them. They knew when someone was coming. They could hear the keys rattling and they knew that their comrade was going to be taken out and tortured and beaten. So when they got back to their cell, that tap code would go, letting them know that there was somebody there for them. Incredible.

Now out of the hundreds of POWs that went to North Vietnam and were captured, there was a crew of the 11 greatest threats to camp security, according to the North Vietnamese. They became known as the Alcatraz 11. My uncle, Bob Shumaker, was one of the Alcatraz 11, along with Admiral Stockdale, who was shot down in 1965. He was the senior U.S. officer present during the camps. And he was considered to be a big troublemaker, no question.

Also, George Coker, who was shot down in 1966. Jeremiah Denton, a United States Senator from the great State of Alabama, was shot down in 1965. Harry Jenkins was shot down also in '65. SAM JOHNSON, whom we talked about, whom we have the honor of serving with here in the United States Congress, was shot down in 1966 on his 25th combat mission. George McKnight was shot down in 1965. James Mulligan was shot down in 1966. Howard Rutledge was shot down in 1965. Ron Storz of the Alcatraz 11 was the only one who did not make it home alive.

Nels Tanner has a unique story. He was the last of the Alcatraz 11. Nels Tanner got his ticket to Alcatraz by making the Vietnamese look bad. When he was being tortured and they were trying to get information about who was his commanding officer, Nels Tanner told them it was “Ben Casey” and “Clark Kent.” Well, here in America, everybody knows Ben Casey and Clark Kent are not real figures. And when word got back to the Vietnamese that they had been made a joke of, he got his ticket to Alcatraz.

Mr. Speaker, I want people to understand Alcatraz for a minute. The rea-

son why these 11 men went to Alcatraz is because they were the thorn in the side of the North Vietnamese. They were the ones that resisted the hardest. They were the ones that caused the problems.

The American fighting men in the Hoa Lo Prison, the Hanoi Hilton, they also caused problems, but these 11 were singled out. And they went into a cell that was—at most generous—about 4 feet by 9. Just imagine that, 4 feet by 9. It is about yea big, at 9 feet in front of you. The Alcatraz 11 spent, on average, about 2½ years in this prison camp. They were able to get out of their cell for 15 minutes a day to be able to go empty their sanitation bucket. They ate in their cell. And they had a tremendous amount of time.

What can you do? The most important muscle that they exercised was their brain, which is why the tap code was so important. But they used other methods. They could cough. They could sneeze. They could try to do different things along those lines. They waved their hands in front of the door so that shadows would be indicative of those letters and they were able to communicate.

Mr. Speaker, let me just say, my uncle built his home in Fairfax Station, Virginia, in his mind long before any brick was laid. Brick by brick, he knew exactly how many bricks it would take. He knew exactly how many feet of pipe it would take. He knew exactly how much lumber. These were the exercises. He built it, tour it down. He built it and tour it down. These were the exercises that these men would go through.

At Alcatraz, SAM JOHNSON learned French through the walls. A product of Texas public schools, he might not have had the opportunity to learn a foreign language. So he used that opportunity in Alcatraz to learn French from Bob Shumaker. It is not the most ideal way to learn French, but the one thing they did have was time.

The Vietnamese tried to strip everything from these men, but there is one thing that they couldn't strip. They couldn't strip their faith. They couldn't strip their honor. And each was determined that they would return to the United States with honor. That, I think, is just remarkable.

One of the things, as we think about February 12, 1973, we cannot miss what was happening back here at home. Their spouses played a vital role and an active role not only with the government but also in the Paris Peace Accords, advocating for the release of the American POWs.

Mr. Speaker, Vietnam was not a popular war, a war that went into living rooms. But the one thing that the American public was able to unite and rally around was our American POWs. Bracelets were worn identifying American POWs and the day that they were shot down.

I have a bracelet, Mr. Speaker, in my office. It is sitting next to two pictures—one of the day Bob Shumaker

was shot down, February 11, 1965, and the other is this picture right here. This is the first time that he had an opportunity to see his wife and his son Grant, who was about 8 years and 3 months at the time, I think. When he had been shot down, his son Grant was only about 3 months old. This is the picture of them being reunited.

I know it is not the best picture for people to be able to view. But in 1973, the styles were a little bit different. So after the release, Bob Shumaker called his wife, Lorraine, and wanted to make sure that she dressed in the fashion of 1965. You can't see the go-go boots, but you can see the miniskirt. And that was how he had remembered her, and that is how he wanted to see her when he got off that plane.

Mr. Speaker, 8 years and a day for Bob Shumaker; 7 years plus for SAM JOHNSON; 5½ years for JOHN MCCAIN. Incredible stories. Torture.

I can tell you that some of America's finest servicemen tried to take their own lives because they thought they let their country down when they gave information to the Vietnamese. But they were pulled up by their comrades, by the men who were next to them in these cells.

There are a couple of others whom I think are particularly interesting, Mr. Speaker.

Everett Alvarez actually was the first American POW. He was a U.S. Navy commander and was held in captivity for 8½ years.

Douglas Hegdahl was really a unique case. Most of the POWs were aviators, whether they were flying for the United States Air Force or the United States Navy. Doug Hegdahl was a guy who was in the Navy but happened to be on a ship. He came up and happened to be standing on the deck. The ship zigged when he thought it would zag, and over the side he went. When he was picked up by the Vietnamese in civilian clothes, they thought he was a member of the Central Intelligence Agency. They put him in the Hoa Lo Prison, and he started to just get along.

One of the things with that tap code that they tried to do each and every day was they would communicate who was newly in the prison. And when you think about trying to memorize the names of all the POWs—because if, for some reason, somebody were to be released or to escape, they wanted to make sure that the United States had the opportunity to know exactly who was in captivity. It was absolutely critical for them, critical for their families to be able to know that they were still alive.

Well, there were a couple of folks, Mr. Speaker, who were released early. I would say that was not necessarily the tack that many of the other POWs would have taken. Doug Hegdahl did not want to be released but was ordered to go because he had a photographic memory and knew every single POW, knew their hometown, their

phone number. When he got back to the United States, he took his time to go to all of these places to visit the families of the POWs, to let them know that their son, that their husband, that their brother was still alive. He had memorized their addresses and phone numbers. He is really a remarkable man.

Bud Day, Mr. Speaker, another pilot that was shot down, sustained significant injuries while flying his F-100F. JOHN MCCAIN credits him for really saving his life. While in captivity, he was in really tough shape. Bud Day was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor, as was Jim Stockdale.

Each and every one of these men—certainly the Alcatraz 11—were highly decorated for their efforts. But I think the thing that was most important to them was being able to return home with honor.

We look at today, Mr. Speaker—February 12, 2015—as a celebration honoring the legacy that these American fighting men have given us all, an incredible faith and a dedication to make sure that each and every one of them was going to return with honor.

There was a ceremony that happened on February 12 as they were discharged and marched out of the Hoa Lo Prison. They were determined to march in rank, as an American fighting force, and then were discharged one by one. The first one shot down would be the first one released. So that was Everett Alvarez. The second one was Bob Shumaker.

They didn't believe that this day had finally come. They saw that C-141 come into Hanoi and really didn't start the real celebration until the 141 had lifted off of that tarmac and the first group of American POWs were on their way home.

Mr. Speaker, I am in awe every time I read stories of these men who did incredible things to endure and to overcome. It is an honor to be able to serve with one in this body, but it is also an honor to be able to stand here today on the day of Operation Homecoming and its 42nd anniversary and to say that America will never forget, America will always remember, that we stood by you then, and we look to stand by all of our men and women in uniform.

□ 1815

We are in the midst of a conflict right now in the midst of a war on terror. We must make sure that we give our men and women that we have asked to go out and defend us the tools necessary to protect our country and to do the job that we have asked them to do. I hope, Madam Speaker, that no one has to endure what these men endured in Hanoi.

I want to thank my colleagues who join me here today, but I also wanted to take this opportunity for those that may be tuning in to let the POWs from the Vietnam conflict know how much they mean not only to me, but to our country. We thank you, and we love you.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE NAACP

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 30 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for the recitation. It was very touching, very moving, and I just want to commend him for keeping the memory alive. Thank you so much.

Madam Speaker, I am honored tonight to thank the leadership and to thank the Members of Congress who have been supportive of this resolution that we bring to the floor for a discussion. This is a resolution that honors the NAACP.

This resolution is not new to the Congress of the United States of America because, in 2006, it actually passed the House of Representatives by a voice vote and then, in 2007, it passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 410-0; in 2008, 403-0; 2009, 424-0; and 2010, 421-0.

I thank the leadership and the Members of this body for the support it has shown to the NAACP with the passage of this resolution through the years.

I am honored to be a member of the NAACP. I take great pride in my membership. I have a life membership in the NAACP. I have been fortunate enough to serve on the board of the Houston branch of the NAACP. I served for nearly a decade as president of the Houston branch of the NAACP, and I have been the beneficiary of the NAACP's works. The NAACP has made America the beautiful a more beautiful America.

Tonight, Madam Speaker, I would like to continue this discussion of the NAACP. I would like to say just a few words first about the founding of the NAACP. It was founded on this day 106 years ago—106 years ago—when approximately 60 people answered what was called the call.

It was a clarion call for persons to come together to talk about and discuss a means by which lynching could be dealt with. Of the 60 people, about seven were African Americans. The NAACP is not now and never has been an organization that has been supported by only African Americans or what some might call a Black organization. It has always been an integrated organization.

After having been founded in 1909, February 12, 106 years ago, the NAACP did embark upon a campaign to end lynching in the United States of America, a sad chapter in our history, but one that we must never forget because we never want to see these things happen again.

As things are doing well now in this area of lynching—we don't have lynchings in the United States of

America, generally speaking, we understand the adage—the premise—that if you don't remember your history, there is a possibility that it can be repeated.

For this reason, we talk about these things. They are a sad chapter in our history, but it is a chapter that we dare not forget. The NAACP, in embarking on this campaign to end lynching, published a publication in 1919 that was styled "30 Years of Lynching in the United States."

It is interesting to note that lynching was so prevalent in the United States that the great Billie Holiday—the great Billie Holiday—sang a song, she was known for this song, styled "Strange Fruit."

This was a song that she could only sing in certain places because this was one of the first songs that dealt with the protest movement around this notion of civil rights and human rights for African Americans. This song was first presented in New York at a nightclub, the Cafe Society.

When she first presented the song, she had much fear and much consternation because she wasn't sure how it would be received. After she finished singing the song, there was a silence. For a moment, she thought that it would not be well received.

Then one person, as is the case with many movements, one person started to applaud and, after that, one person, then another and another. Then she received a very loud ovation for this song.

I am going to share the words to the song with us tonight because this song is probably one of her signature songs, but it is also a song that predated "We Shall Overcome," which was a part of the civil rights movement, the contemporary civil rights movement.

These are the words to the song, and you will have some appreciation for why I am mentioning it to you. The words are:

Southern trees bear a strange fruit,
Blood on the leaves and blood at the root,
Black bodies swinging in the Southern breeze,
Strange fruit hanging from the poplar trees.

Of course, we know that this song is referring to the lynchings that were taking place. In fact, between 1882 and 1968, according to Tuskegee Institute, there were 3,446 African Americans lynched in the United States of America—a sad chapter in our history.

This is why the NAACP came into being. In part, it was established to ensure political, educational, social, and economic equality for all persons—for all persons—not just African Americans, not just Blacks, not just as we were known at that time, Negroes, but for all persons; and it was established as well to eliminate racial hatred and racial discrimination—all noble challenges and challenges that we would easily embrace today.

At that time, when the NAACP was founded, because of lynchings that were taking place and because of a de-

sire to make sure that all persons were treated fairly and equally, it was a difficult thing to do.

The NAACP, I am proud to say, has a history of being on the right side of right. It is consistently on the right side of right. The NAACP was on the right side of right in 1948 and 1953 when it filed and won the lawsuits *Shelley v. Kraemer* and *Barrows v. Jackson*. These lawsuits dealt with restrictive covenants.

There was a time in this country when persons could restrict the sale of property to people simply because of who they were, the hue of their skin, restrict the sale of property to people because of the way they looked.

These two lawsuits were taken to the Supreme Court of the United States of America and were won. If the truth be told, we sleep where we sleep and we live where we live because of the NAACP, because the NAACP was on the right side of right.

What is interesting about this proposition of being on the right side of right, Madam Speaker, is the notion that when you are what I call—what some others would call a Monday morning quarterback, but what I call a hindsight quarterback—a hindsight quarterback, that is my phrase—when you are a hindsight quarterback, it is easy to be on the right side of right because others have had to suffer the slings and arrows associated with being on the right side of right at the right time, in the right place, in the right space. The NAACP has dared to be on the right side of right when it was very difficult to be there.

In 1948 and 1953, when *Shelley v. Kraemer* and *Barrows v. Jackson* were litigated, it was not easy to be on the right side of right, to talk about integrating neighborhoods, to talk about selling property to anybody if they could pay the price of the cost of the property.

Being on the right side of right means something in the country that we know and love. It means something in a country that stands for the proposition of liberty and justice for all, a country that stands for the notion that government should be of the people, by the people, and for the people.

It means something to be on the right side of right; hence it means something to have an organization like the NAACP that will step forward using litigation when necessary, protests when needed, but always a peaceful means to a just end. The NAACP has been there and has always been consistently on the right side of right.

The NAACP was on the right side of right in 1954 when it won the lawsuit *Brown v. Board of Education*. I would daresay that we eat where we eat because of the NAACP and we go to the schools that we go to because of the NAACP.

The NAACP took that lawsuit to the Supreme Court under the leadership of the Honorable Thurgood Marshall with the aid and assistance of the honorable

Charles Hamilton Houston and won that lawsuit, placing the NAACP again on the right side of right, overturning decades of injustice with one single lawsuit. The NAACP made a difference in the lives of all Americans.

The truth be told, if we did not have the NAACP, we would have to create it because you need an organization like the NAACP. You need an organization that is willing to take a bold stand in difficult times, an organization that understands that it is not easy to be on the right side of right, but that understands also that a great country has to move forward, and to do so, it must be on the right side of right.

Let me pause for just a moment because we have had a great sage come into the Chamber tonight. He is, of course, the sage from New York. We know him as the Honorable CHARLIE RANGEL.

I know him as a friend to all of humanity, a person who has consistently been on the right side of right, a person who speaks with clarity, with force, sincerity, and he actually calls them as he sees them, without any fear and without any belief that there are consequences that can be of great harm to him, such that he should not speak truth to power.

Tonight, I am honored to ask my dear friend if he would join me and give his commentary on the NAACP.

I will now yield to the gentleman from New York City, the Honorable CHARLES RANGEL.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Let me thank my friend and colleague for giving me an opportunity to thank an organization that, unfortunately, so many Americans, Black and White, have taken for granted.

Earlier today, I was sitting on the floor next to one of my Republican friends from the South, and we were talking about Selma. He had recently seen the motion picture, and he was shocked that something like this could have happened.

Me being an oldtimer, I was surprised that he did not know that those things had gone on, but it was the graphics in the motion picture and the change in attitude that people have.

□ 1830

And it reminded me that this happened in my lifetime, to see somebody from the same culture, the same background, now seeing things obscene that should never happen in our great country.

Now, if people could have stood up 60 years ago and subjected themselves as some people did in Selma and put their life on the line in the early sixties, as JOHN LEWIS and so many others did—because I would like to remind everybody I did the march too, but it was after Bloody Sunday. I was not thinking about putting my life on the line. And putting my feet on the line for 54

miles was an ordeal for me, because I didn't fully understand the concept and the threat to human life that was taking place in the sixties.

Imagine what it was when the NAACP was formed. Imagine the threat that Blacks and Whites had formed this organization to bring us together during the time that slavery had just been over and this organization has continued. I cannot begin to tell you, Congressman, at my age, the number of civil rights organizations and political organizations and religious organizations that I have worked through in my lifetime.

But no matter what the internal debate is, no matter what state our Nation is in, the NAACP has managed, during very rough economic times and hard political times, to keep going step by step and never falling back. And when the whole country and parts of the world were rejoicing over the Voting Rights Act and the Civil Rights Act—and we see what recently happened to the Supreme Court. Why was nobody surprised that, once again, in front of the Supreme Court, organizing the entire Nation to do the right thing was the National Association of Colored People?

And so I just wish that, without solicitation, we can find some way to thank those faceless people who never get their names and pictures in the newspaper, go out to the meeting, active in voter registration, and whenever anybody in any community wants to go there for a rally, the first thing they do is call the local branch of the NAACP to make certain that someone would show up. Because the NAACP doesn't do these things for press conferences. They don't do it because they want their names in the newspaper. They have too much credibility and have done too much work and have suffered too much to risk their reputation for something like that.

So I am so grateful and appreciative that you would focus in the well of the Congress, and certainly we all admit that notwithstanding what Dr. Martin Luther King and so many others that we don't know their names have done to bring some sense of equality in our great Nation, that the NAACP was there 100 years ago doing the same thing and then hoping and praying that they can improve the quality of life for all of us. And guess what? They are still doing it.

Thank you for your commitment.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you very much, Mr. RANGEL, for your very eloquent recitation. Once again, you have risen, you have stepped up to the plate, and we are most appreciative that you took a moment to come over and be with us. Thank you very much.

If I may now, we have another Member of the Congress with us from the 18th Congressional District in the State of Texas. She is a voice for the voiceless, a very powerful voice, not only in Congress, but across the length and breadth of the country when it

comes to human rights, human dignity, and human decency.

I am honored to have my colleague with me tonight, the Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE, who is adjacent to me, the Ninth Congressional District in Houston, Texas. The Honorable SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Congressman, thank you so very much. And, again, my greatest appreciation for your annual tribute to the NAACP. We are reminded of its great history. You are the carrier of this dream and this celebration. We are appreciative that you have come to this Congress and done many things, but you brought us to a moment every year to be able to honor this storied organization 106 years old. So let me thank my good friend Congressman GREEN, my next-door neighbor in Houston, and a friend of many of the same friends.

We know the work of the NAACP local chapter in Houston, Texas. Now, the leading President is, as I call him, Dean James Douglas. Many presidents before, of course, have ably served our local chapter, but we come today to acknowledge the grandness of the NAACP. And as my colleague, Congressman RANGEL, just mentioned, it is an organization that is everywhere in all ways.

It is well to note that many of the successes that we have had in freedom, justice, and liberty have come about through the NAACP. President Truman was the first President in 1948 to speak to the NAACP. But it was not just an oration, if you will. The NAACP seeks to work, collaborate, and get things done. It was that close relationship with President Truman that generated a commission that in the late 1940s, after World War II, where soldiers came home to a second-class citizenship.

Soldiers who left the hills and valleys of America, the farms, and the urban centers of America, African Americans, colored boys, who went into World War II came out as a second-class citizen. You will hear stories of soldiers coming back home being forced off trains or in the back of the train or the back of the bus, not being offered food at a train station, even with the uniform on.

So heroes that had fought in the war and managed to survive and come home still came to a segregated America. It was in that backdrop that President Truman spoke to the NAACP, and they called for a commission to address the question of civil rights in America. Out of that came the—because it was in the realm of World War II, out of that came an important announcement that really, I think, was the predecessor to desegregating America. That, of course, was the executive order that desegregated the United States military. That is the clout of the NAACP.

Through the years—through the years—the NAACP certainly has a long history, starting in its early birth. But I want to carry it forward into the 1950s and into the utilization of Thurgood Marshall. Now it is called

the NAACP Legal Defense Fund that separated it out, but it was these lawyers of the NAACP that rose to defend those in the civil rights movement who were the foot soldiers and the actors of the civil rights movement, meaning acting on the issue, the activists. And they had the cerebral opportunity, if you will, the cerebral leaders, the lawyers, that came together to provide them the legal armor that they needed. Certainly we know that Thurgood Marshall had a very fond expression and appreciation for the NAACP.

So we come through these years in the 1950s and the 1960s. And the kind of continued support that the NAACP provided in lasting and embracing—lasting and embracing—so it embraced the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, which I had the privilege of working for. It embraced various other organizations. It embraced the various faiths in our community, and it embraced any organization that was moving toward justice, as Dr. King said, bending that arc toward justice. The NAACP was there with its many chapters, and it was there with providing the education of so many of these individuals that were, in fact, I call them, foot soldiers in every hamlet of America.

Now we come, if I may cite him, in the civil rights movement, again joining with those marching across the Edmund Pettus Bridge, being a mighty vehicle, if I might, a lobbyist. I understand Congressman Clarence Mitchell was called the 101st Senator. He was a lobbyist for the NAACP. He was on the cutting edge of every single civil rights legislation for a period of, I believe, 40 years. I may be exaggerating the timeframe, but he was there for the '64 Civil Rights Act, there for the '65 Voting Rights Act. Clarence Mitchell of the NAACP was an advocate, not a lobbyist, on behalf of the NAACP, and met and stood, if you will, to debate not on the floor of the Senate with the Strom Thurmonds and others who had a different opinion about desegregation of this country.

Let me take note of the fact that today I had the privilege of seeing an unveiling of a stamp in honor of Robert Robinson Taylor, the great-grandfather of Valerie Jarrett. And what I would say is that even his success in the backdrop of being the first graduate of MIT, African American graduate, you can be assured that the NAACP was moving along to add to the civil rights aspect of the great outstanding success and leadership that this gentleman, Mr. Taylor, has shown.

So the NAACP has been there to make a pathway. The NAACP has been there to embrace. The NAACP has been there to collaborate. The NAACP has been there to stand with you when you need them to stand with you.

I close by indicating that we have had a challenging year of addressing issues of criminal justice reform, and I am very grateful that the NAACP has also taken up this issue and will be a

partner on this issue of criminal justice reform, working with many of us as we commit to America—not just African Americans—that we will answer the question dealing with justice, equality, and liberty.

I pay tribute, finally, Mr. GREEN, to the leader of ACT-SO, who lost her life, in the local chapter of the NAACP. I want to honor her and thank her for the years that I knew her and her service to young people in the ACT-SO program in Houston, Texas. To her family, I want to thank her so much for the work that she did and the lives that she touched.

That is the NAACP. Tonight, I say, “I am the NAACP.” Congratulations for 106 years.

Thank you, Mr. GREEN, for yielding.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Thank you very much. I applaud you for your very kind words about the NAACP, and I also compliment you for giving us additional examples of the NAACP being on the right side of right—the right side of right.

With the history that it has for being on the right side of right, one can imagine 100 years from now, when someone looks through the vista of time back upon this time, when the NAACP is the champion right now for voting rights, who will be on the right side of right when we look back?

I think that is important for us to consider because we never want to be on the wrong side of history, but we are in a situation right now where it will take some courage for some people to be on the right side of right as we tackle this question of voting rights, voting rights that have been diminished by the evisceration of section 4 of the Voting Rights Act, which emasculated section 5 of the Voting Rights Act, which means that there is no coverage. We have to now find a way to reinstate section 4 of the Voting Rights Act.

Who will be on the right side of right? Who will be with the NAACP? When we look back 100 years from now and we examine these circumstances and we understand that it was not easy to be on the right side of right, who will be there so that we can accomplish, again, what the NAACP has fought for for many decades in this country?

I thank you, again, Madam Speaker. I thank the leadership for this opportunity. Our time has expired, but our energies are still with us, and we will continue to be a part of this great august organization known as the NAACP, as it continues to be on the right side of right.

I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING THE SERVICE OF THE MEN OF THE VIETNAM WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENHAM. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Forty years ago today, the first flight carrying U.S. prisoners of war out of North Vietnam lifted off from Hanoi to take the first 40 U.S. servicemen to freedom.

These men, some of whom had been held for 8 years in a brutal captivity, were just a small cohort of more than 683 Americans known to have been held in North Vietnamese prisons and the first of 591 POWs returned to American soil after the Paris Peace Accords through Operation Homecoming.

□ 1845

Sadly, 92 Americans died in captivity, and to this day, more than 1,000 Americans who served in Indochina during the Vietnam war era are still unaccounted for.

Today, we are here to honor both the men who survived and those who never returned. Their extraordinary courage, endurance, and sacrifice should be an example for everyone in this Chamber and across the country.

I would, in particular, like to recall the service of my good friend Senator JOHN MCCAIN and of our colleague here in the House, SAM JOHNSON, who spent nearly 7 years as a prisoner of war—many of them locked in solitary confinement.

The treatment that Congressman SAM JOHNSON and Senator MCCAIN faced inside the prisons was designed to break those held. To force them to give military information or to serve as propaganda tools for the North Vietnamese regime, physical and emotional torture were used to compel cooperation. The denial of food and sleep deprivation were regular, beatings with bars and whips were common, and the binding of POWs with ropes and then dislocating their arms and legs was a favorite tactic.

The names of the places that they were held have entered the lexicon—the Hanoi Hilton, the Alcatraz, and the Dogpatch—all names that conjure up images of cramped cells, isolation, filth, and savage pain.

Madam Speaker, it is worth remembering that the North Vietnamese, in order to justify their treatment of the American captives, declared all of their prisoners to be war criminals and denied them all protections of the Geneva Convention.

What is most remarkable is these men never broke. They kept faith with their country and with each other despite the extraordinary costs to themselves.

When asked what kept them going, many responded their faith in God and their fellow prisoners. Commander Paul Galanti stated:

What held me together was faith—four of 'em: faith in God, faith in my fellow POWs—many of whom I'd never met, although I felt closer to them than my own family—faith in my fellow military forces and leaders whom I knew wouldn't let us down, and, finally, faith in the USA.

Madam Speaker, these stories and the others shared by my colleagues

here tonight should remind us of the terrible price paid by those who serve our country and of the debt we owe to each of them. We must also continue to make every effort to recover the 1,636 missing in action from the Vietnam war.

I would like to thank Mr. DOLD for speaking earlier tonight on this topic.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. PEARCE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical emergency.

Mr. HONDA (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the afternoon of today until February 13 on account of official business.

Mr. SWALWELL of California (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today starting at 1:30 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of traveling with the President and participating in a forum on cybersecurity.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

AMENDMENT TO THE RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE FOR THE 114TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, February 12, 2015.

Hon. JOHN A. BOEHNER,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to submit for printing in the Congressional Record, pursuant to Rule XI, clause 2(a) of the Rules of the House, a copy of the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture, which were adopted at the organizational meeting of the Committee on January 22, 2015, and revised at the business meeting of the Committee today, February 12, 2015.

Appendix A of the Committee Rules will include excerpts from the Rules of the House relevant to the operation of the Committee. Appendix B will include relevant excerpts from the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. In the interests of minimizing printing costs, Appendices A and B are omitted from this submission.

Sincerely,

K. MICHAEL CONAWAY,
Chairman.

(As adopted January 22, 2015, and revised February 12, 2015)

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(a) Applicability of House Rules.—(1) The Rules of the House shall govern the procedure of the Committee and its subcommittees, and the Rules of the Committee on Agriculture so far as applicable shall be interpreted in accordance with the Rules of the House, except that a motion to recess from day to day, and a motion to dispense with the first reading (in full) of a bill or resolution, if printed copies are available, are non-debatable privileged motions in the Committee and its subcommittees. (See Appendix A for the applicable Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.)

(2) As provided in clause 1(a)(2) of House Rule XI, each Subcommittee is part of the

Committee and is subject to the authority and direction of the Committee and its Rules so far as applicable. (See also Committee Rules III, IV, V, VI, VII, VIII and XI, *infra*.)

(b) Authority to Conduct Investigations.—The Committee and its subcommittees, after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee, may conduct such investigations and studies as they may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of their responsibilities under Rule X of the Rules of the House and in accordance with clause 2(m) of House Rule XI.

(c) Authority to Print.—The Committee is authorized by the Rules of the House to have printed and bound testimony and other data presented at hearings held by the Committee and its subcommittees. All costs of stenographic services and transcripts in connection with any meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall be paid from applicable accounts of the House described in clause 1(i)(1) of House Rule X in accordance with clause 1(c) of House Rule XI. (See also paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of Committee Rule IX.)

(d) Vice Chairman.—The Member of the majority party on the Committee or Subcommittee designated by the Chairman of the full Committee shall be the vice chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee in accordance with clause 2(d) of House Rule XI.

(e) Presiding Member.—If the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee is not present at any Committee or Subcommittee meeting or hearing, the vice chairman shall preside. If the Chairman and vice chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee are not present at a Committee or Subcommittee meeting or hearing the ranking Member of the majority party who is present shall preside in accordance with clause 2(d), House Rule XI.

(f) Publication of Rules.—The Committee's Rules shall be publicly available in electronic form and published in the Congressional Record not later than 30 days after the Chair is elected in each odd-numbered year as provided in clause 2(a) of House Rule XI.

(g) Joint Committee Reports of Investigation or Study.—A report of an investigation or study conducted jointly by more than one committee may be filed jointly, provided that each of the committees complies independently with all requirements for approval and filing of the report.

RULE II.—COMMITTEE BUSINESS MEETINGS— REGULAR, ADDITIONAL AND SPECIAL

(a) Regular Meetings.—Regular meetings of the Committee, in accordance with clause 2(b) of House Rule XI, shall be held on the first Wednesday of every month to transact its business if notice is given pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of House Rule XI. The Chairman shall provide each Member of the Committee, as far in advance of the day of the regular meeting as practicable, a written agenda of such meeting. Items may be placed on the agenda by the Chairman or a majority of the Committee. (See paragraph (f) of Committee Rule XI for provisions that apply to meetings of subcommittees.)

(b) Additional Meetings.—(1) The Chairman may call and convene, as he or she considers necessary, which may not commence earlier than the third day on which Members have notice thereof after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or after concurrence with the Ranking Minority Member, additional meetings of the Committee for the consideration of any bill or resolution pending before the Committee or for the conduct of other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such additional meetings pursuant to the notice from the Chairman.

(2) A hearing or meeting may begin sooner than specified in clause (1) (in which case the chair shall make the announcement specified at the earliest possible time) if the Committee so determines by majority vote in the presence of the number of Members required under the Rules of the Committee for the transaction of business.

(3) At least 24 hours prior to the commencement of a meeting for the markup of a measure or matter the Chair shall cause the text of such measure or matter to be made publicly available in electronic form.

(c) Special Meetings.—If at least three Members of the Committee desire that a special meeting of the Committee be called by the Chairman, those Members may file in the offices of the Committee their written request to the Chairman for such special meeting. Such request shall specify the measure or matters to be considered. Immediately upon the filing of the request, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk of the Committee for such purpose) shall notify the Chairman of the filing of the request. If, within 3 calendar days after the filing of the request, the Chairman does not call the requested special meeting to be held within 7 calendar days after the filing of the request, a majority of the Members of the Committee may file in the offices of the Committee their written notice that a special meeting of the Committee will be held, specifying the date and hour thereof, and the measures or matter to be considered at that special meeting in accordance with clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI. The Committee shall meet on that date and hour. Immediately upon the filing of the notice, the Majority Staff Director (serving as the clerk) of the Committee shall notify all Members of the Committee that such meeting will be held and inform them of its date and hour and the measure or matter to be considered, and only the measure or matter specified in that notice may be considered at that special meeting.

RULE III.—OPEN MEETINGS AND HEARINGS; BROADCASTING

(a) Open Meetings and Hearings.—Each meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, and each hearing by the Committee or a Subcommittee shall be open to the public unless closed in accordance with clause 2(g) of House Rule XI. (See Appendix A.)

(b) Broadcasting and Photography.—Whenever a Committee or Subcommittee meeting for the transaction of business, including the markup of legislation, or a hearing is open to the public, that meeting or hearing shall:

(1) To the maximum extent practicable the Committee shall provide audio and video coverage of each hearing or meeting for the transaction of business in a manner that allows the public to easily listen to and view the proceedings and shall maintain the recordings of such coverage in a manner that is easily accessible to the public.

(2) Be open to coverage by television, radio, and still photography in accordance with clause 4 of House Rule XI (See Appendix A). When such radio coverage is conducted in the Committee or Subcommittee, written notice to that effect shall be placed on the desk of each Member. The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, shall not limit the number of television or still cameras permitted in a hearing or meeting room to fewer than two representatives from each medium (except for legitimate space or safety considerations, in which case pool coverage shall be authorized).

(c) Closed Meetings—Attendees.—No person other than Members of the Committee or Subcommittee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the Committee or Subcommittee may authorize

shall be present at any business or markup session that has been closed to the public as provided in clause 2(g)(1) of House Rule XI.

(d) Addressing the Committee.—A Committee Member may address the Committee or a Subcommittee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration (See Committee Rule VIII (e) relating to questioning a witness at a hearing). The time a Member may address the Committee or Subcommittee for any such purpose shall be limited to 5 minutes, except that this time limit may be waived by unanimous consent. A Member shall also be limited in his or her remarks to the subject matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend his or her remarks beyond such subject.

(e) Meetings to Begin Promptly.—Subject to the presence of a quorum, each meeting or hearing of the Committee and its subcommittees shall begin promptly at the time so stipulated in the public announcement of the meeting or hearing.

(f) Prohibition on Proxy Voting.—No vote by any Member of the Committee or Subcommittee with respect to any measure or matter may be cast by proxy.

(g) Location of Persons at Meetings.—No person other than the Committee or Subcommittee Members and Committee or Subcommittee staff may be seated in the rostrum area during a meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee unless by unanimous consent of Committee or Subcommittee.

(h) Consideration of Amendments and Motions.—A Member, upon request, shall be recognized by the Chairman to address the Committee or Subcommittee at a meeting for a period limited to 5 minutes on behalf of an amendment or motion offered by the Member or another Member, or upon any other matter under consideration, unless the Member receives unanimous consent to extend the time limit. Every amendment or motion made in Committee or Subcommittee shall, upon the demand of any Member present, be reduced to writing, and a copy thereof shall be made available to all Members present. Such amendment or motion shall not be pending before the Committee or Subcommittee or voted on until the requirements of this paragraph have been met.

(i) Demanding Record Vote.—

(1) A record vote of the Committee or Subcommittee on a question or action shall be ordered on a demand by one-fifth of the Members present.

(2) The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may postpone further proceedings when a record vote is ordered on the question of approving a measure or matter or on adopting an amendment. If the Chairman postpones further proceedings:

(A) The Chairman may resume such postponed proceedings, after giving Members adequate notice, at a time chosen in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member; and

(B) notwithstanding any intervening order for the previous question, the underlying proposition on which proceedings were postponed shall remain subject to further debate or amendment to the same extent as when the question was postponed.

(j) Submission of Motions or Amendments In Advance of Business Meetings.—The Committee and Subcommittee Chairman may request and Committee and Subcommittee Members should, insofar as practicable, cooperate in providing copies of proposed amendments or motions to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or the Subcommittee twenty-four hours before a Committee or Subcommittee business meeting.

(k) Points of Order.—No point of order against the hearing or meeting procedures of

the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entertained unless it is made in a timely fashion.

(l) **Limitation on Committee Sitzings.**—The Committee or subcommittees may not sit during a joint session of the House and Senate or during a recess when a joint meeting of the House and Senate is in progress.

(m) **Prohibition of Wireless Telephones.**—Use of wireless phones during a Committee or Subcommittee hearing or meeting is prohibited.

RULE IV.—QUORUMS

(a) **Working Quorum.**—One-third of the Members of the Committee or a Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for taking any action, other than as noted in paragraphs (b) and (c).

(b) **Majority Quorum.**—A majority of the Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for:

(1) the reporting of a bill, resolution or other measure (See clause 2(h)(1) of House Rules XI, and Committee Rule IX);

(2) the closing of a meeting or hearing to the public pursuant to clauses 2(g), 2(k)(5) and 2(k)(7) of the Rule XI of the Rules of the House;

(3) the authorizing of a subpoena as provided in clause 2(m)(3), of House Rule XI (See also Committee Rule VII.); and

(4) as where required by a Rule of the House.

(c) **Quorum for Taking Testimony.**—Two Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall constitute a quorum for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

RULE V.—RECORDS

(a) **Maintenance of Records.**—The Committee shall keep a complete record of all Committee and Subcommittee action which shall include:

(1) in the case of any meeting or hearing transcripts, a substantially verbatim account of remarks actually made during the proceedings, subject only to technical, grammatical and typographical corrections authorized by the person making the remarks involved, and

(2) written minutes shall include a record of all Committee and Subcommittee action and a record of all votes on any question and a tally on all record votes.

The result of each such record vote shall be made available by the Committee for inspection by the public at reasonable times in the offices of the Committee and by telephone request and also made publicly available in electronic form within 48 hours of such record vote. Not later than 24 hours after adoption of an amendment to a measure or matter, the chair of the Committee shall cause the text of such amendment adopted thereto to be made publicly available in electronic form. Information so available for public inspection shall include a description of the amendment, motion, order or other proposition and the name of each Member voting for and each Member voting against such amendment, motion, order, or proposition, and the names of those Members present but not voting.

(b) **Access to and Correction of Records.**—Any public witness, or person authorized by such witness, during Committee office hours in the Committee offices and within 10 calendar days of the close of hearings, may obtain a transcript copy of that public witness's testimony and make such technical, grammatical and typographical corrections as authorized by the person making the remarks involved as will not alter the nature of testimony given. There shall be prompt return of such corrected copy of the transcript to the Committee. Members of the Committee or Subcommittee shall receive copies of transcripts for their prompt review

and correction and prompt return to the Committee. The Committee or Subcommittee may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any Member or witness if it determines that such Member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time in which to make such corrections and further delay would seriously impede the consideration of the legislative action that is subject of the hearing. The record of a hearing shall be closed 10 calendar days after the last oral testimony, unless the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise. Any person requesting to file a statement for the record of a hearing must so request before the hearing concludes and must file the statement before the record is closed unless the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise. The Committee or Subcommittee may reject any statement in light of its length or its tendency to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person.

(c) **Property of the House.**—All Committee and Subcommittee records (including hearings data, charts, and files) shall be kept separate and distinct from the congressional office records of the Members serving as Chairman and such records shall be the property of the House and all Members of the House shall have access thereto. The Majority Staff Director shall promptly notify the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of any request for access to such records.

(d) **Availability of Archived Records.**—The records of the Committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with House Rule VII. The Chairman shall notify the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee of the need for a Committee order pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of such House Rule, to withhold a record otherwise available.

(e) **Special Rules for Certain Records and Proceedings.**—A stenographic record of a business meeting of the Committee or Subcommittee may be kept and thereafter may be published if the Chairman of the Committee, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determines there is need for such a record. The proceedings of the Committee or Subcommittee in a closed meeting, evidence or testimony in such meeting, shall not be divulged unless otherwise determined by a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee.

(f) **Electronic Availability of Committee Publications.**—To the maximum extent feasible, the Committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

RULE VI.—POWER TO SIT AND ACT.

For the purpose of carrying out any of its function and duties under House Rules X and XI, the Committee and each of its subcommittees is authorized to sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned and to hold such hearings.

RULE VII.—SUBPOENAS AND OATHS.

(a) **Issuance of Subpoenas.**—In accordance with clause House Rule XI, clause 2(m), a subpoena may be authorized and issued by a majority of the Committee or by the Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member. Such consultation shall occur at least 48 hours in advance of a subpoena being issued under such authority. Authorized subpoenas shall be signed by the Chairman of the Committee or by any Member designated by the Committee.

(b) **Oaths.**—The Chairman of the Committee, or any member of the Committee designated by the Chairman, may administer oaths to any witnesses.

RULE VIII.—HEARING PROCEDURES

(a) **Power to Hear.**—For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under House Rule X and XI, the Committee and its subcommittees are authorized to sit and hold hearings at any time or place within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned. (See Committee Rule VI and paragraph (f) of Committee Rule XI for provisions relating to Subcommittee hearings and meetings.)

(b) **Announcement.**—The Chairman of the Committee shall after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee, make a public announcement of the date, place and subject matter of any Committee hearing at least 1 week before the commencement of the hearing. The Chairman of a Subcommittee shall schedule a hearing only after consultation with the Chairman of the Committee and after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee, and the Chairmen of the other subcommittees after such consultation with the Committee Chairman, and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make a public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of such hearing at least 1 week before the hearing. If the Chairman of the Committee or the Subcommittee, with concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee or Subcommittee, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, or if the Committee or Subcommittee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, as appropriate, shall request the Majority Staff Director to make such public announcement at the earliest possible date. The clerk of the Committee shall promptly notify the Daily Digest Clerk of the Congressional Record, and shall promptly enter the appropriate information into the Committee scheduling service of the House Information Systems as soon as possible after such public announcement is made.

(c) **Scheduling of Witnesses.**—Except as otherwise provided in this rule, the scheduling of witnesses and determination of the time allowed for the presentation of testimony at hearings shall be at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise.

(d) **Written Statement; Oral Testimony.**—(1) Each witness who is to appear before the Committee or a Subcommittee, shall insofar as practicable file with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee, at least 2 working days before the day of his or her appearance, a written statement of proposed testimony. Witnesses shall provide sufficient copies of their statement for distribution to Committee or Subcommittee Members, staff, and the news media. Insofar as practicable, the Committee or Subcommittee staff shall distribute such written statements to all Members of the Committee or Subcommittee as soon as they are received as well as any official reports from departments and agencies on such subject matter. All witnesses may be limited in their oral presentations to brief summaries of their statements within the time allotted to them, at the discretion of the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee, in light of the nature of the testimony and the length of time available.

(2) As noted in paragraph (b) of Committee Rule VII, the Chairman of the Committee or any Member designated by the Chairman, may administer an oath to any witness.

(3) To the greatest extent practicable, each witness appearing in a non-governmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony:

(i) a curriculum vitae;

(ii) disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current calendar year or either of the 2 preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness; and

(iii) disclosure of the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract related to the subject matter of the hearing originating with a foreign government received during the current calendar year or either of the 2 preceding calendar years by the witness or by an entity represented by the witness.

Such statements, with appropriate redactions to protect the privacy of witnesses, shall be made publicly available in electronic form not later than 1 day after the witness appears.

(e) Questioning of Witnesses.—Committee or Subcommittee Members may question witnesses only when they have been recognized by the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee for that purpose. Each Member so recognized shall be limited to questioning a witness for 5 minutes until such time as each Member of the Committee or Subcommittee who so desires has had an opportunity to question the witness for 5 minutes; and thereafter the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may limit the time of a further round of questioning after giving due consideration to the importance of the subject matter and the length of time available. All questions put to witnesses shall be germane to the measure or matter under consideration. Unless a majority of the Committee or Subcommittee determines otherwise, no Committee or Subcommittee staff shall interrogate witnesses.

(f) Extended Questioning for Designated Members.—Notwithstanding paragraph (e), the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member may designate an equal number of Members from each party to question a witness for a period not longer than 60 minutes.

(g) Witnesses for the Minority.—When any hearing is conducted by the Committee or any Subcommittee upon any measure or matter, the minority party Members on the Committee or Subcommittee shall be entitled, upon request to the Chairman by a majority of those minority Members before the completion of such hearing, to call witnesses selected by the minority to testify with respect to that measure or matter during at least 1 day of hearing thereon as provided in clause 2(j)(1) of House Rule XI.

(h) Summary of Subject Matter.—Upon announcement of a hearing, to the extent practicable, the Committee shall make available immediately to all Members of the Committee a concise summary of the subject matter (including legislative reports and other material) under consideration. In addition, upon announcement of a hearing and subsequently as they are received, the Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee shall, to the extent practicable, make available to the Members of the Committee any official reports from departments and agencies on such matter. (See Committee Rule XI(f).)

(i) Open Hearings.—Each hearing conducted by the Committee or Subcommittee shall be open to the public, including radio, television and still photography coverage, except as provided in clause 4 of House Rule XI (see also Committee Rule III(b)). In any event, no Member of the House may be excluded from nonparticipatory attendance at any hearing unless the House by majority vote shall authorize the Committee or Subcommittee, for purposes of a particular series of hearings on a particular bill or resolution or on a particular subject of investigation, to close its hearings to Members by means of the above procedure.

(j) Hearings and Reports.—(1)(i) The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee at a hearing shall announce in an opening statement the subject of the investigation. A copy of the Committee Rules (and the applicable provisions of clause 2 of House Rule XI, regarding hearing procedures, an excerpt of which appears in Appendix A thereto) shall be made available to each witness upon request. Witnesses at hearings may be accompanied by their own counsel for the purpose of advising them concerning their constitutional rights. The Chairman of the Committee or Subcommittee may punish breaches of order and decorum, and of professional ethics on the part of counsel, by censure and exclusion from the hearings; but only the full Committee may cite the offender to the House for contempt.

(ii) Whenever it is asserted by a Member of the Committee that the evidence or testimony at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or it is asserted by a witness that the evidence or testimony that the witness would give at a hearing may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate the witness, such testimony or evidence shall be presented in executive session, notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (i) of this rule, if by a majority of those present, there being in attendance the requisite number required under the Rules of the Committee to be present for the purpose of taking testimony, the Committee or Subcommittee determines that such evidence or testimony may tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person. The Committee or Subcommittee shall afford a person an opportunity voluntarily to appear as a witness; and the Committee or Subcommittee shall receive and shall dispose of requests from such person to subpoena additional witnesses.

(iii) No evidence or testimony taken in executive session may be released or used in public sessions without the consent of the Committee or Subcommittee. In the discretion of the Committee or Subcommittee, witnesses may submit brief and pertinent statements in writing for inclusion in the record. The Committee or Subcommittee is the sole judge of the pertinency of testimony and evidence adduced at its hearings. A witness may obtain a transcript copy of his or her testimony given at a public session or, if given at an executive session, when authorized by the Committee or Subcommittee. (See paragraph (c) of Committee Rule V.)

(2) A proposed investigative or oversight report shall be considered as read if it has been available to the Members of the Committee for at least 24 hours (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays except when the House is in session on such day) in advance of their consideration.

RULE IX.—THE REPORTING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

(a) Filing of Reports.—The Chairman shall report or cause to be reported promptly to the House any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee and shall take or cause to be taken all necessary steps to bring such bill, resolution, or other measure to a vote. No bill, resolution, or measure shall be reported from the Committee unless a majority of Committee is actually present. A Committee report on any bill, resolution, or other measure approved by the Committee shall be filed within 7 calendar days (not counting days on which the House is not in session) after the day on which there has been filed with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee a written request, signed by a majority of the Committee, for the reporting of that bill or resolution. The Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall notify the Chairman immediately when such a request is filed.

(b) Content of Reports.—Each Committee report on any bill or resolution approved by the Committee shall include as separately identified sections:

(1) a statement of the intent or purpose of the bill or resolution;

(2) a statement describing the need for such bill or resolution;

(3) a statement of Committee and Subcommittee consideration of the measure including a summary of amendments and motions offered and the actions taken thereon;

(4) the results of the each record vote on any amendment in the Committee and Subcommittee and on the motion to report the measure or matter, including the names of those Members and the total voting for and the names of those Members and the total voting against such amendment or motion (See clause 3(b) of House Rule XIII);

(5) the oversight findings and recommendations of the Committee with respect to the subject matter of the bill or resolution as required pursuant to clause 3(c)(1) of House Rule XIII and clause 2(b)(1) of House Rule X;

(6) the detailed statement described in House Rule XIII clause 3(c)(2) and section 308(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if the bill or resolution provides new budget authority (other than continuing appropriations), new spending authority described in section 401(c)(2) of such Act, new credit authority, or an increase or decrease in revenues or tax expenditures, except that the estimates with respect to new budget authority shall include, when practicable, a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) to the appropriate levels under current law;

(7) the estimate of costs and comparison of such estimates, if any, prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office in connection with such bill or resolution pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if submitted in timely fashion to the Committee;

(8) a statement of general performance goals and objectives, including outcome-related goals and objectives, for which the measure authorizes funding;

(9) an estimate by the Committee of the costs that would be incurred in carrying out such bill or joint resolution in the fiscal year in which it is reported and for its authorized duration or for each of the 5 fiscal years following the fiscal year of reporting, whichever period is less (see House Rule XIII, clause 3(d)(2), (3) and (h)(2), (3)), together with—(i) a comparison of these estimates with those made and submitted to the Committee by any Government agency when practicable, and (ii) a comparison of the total estimated funding level for the relevant program (or programs) with appropriate levels under current law (The provisions of this clause do not apply if a cost estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 has been timely submitted prior to the filing of the report and included in the report);

(10) a list of congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, and limited tariff benefits in the bill or in the report (and the name of any Member, Delegate, or Resident Commissioner who submitted a request to the Committee for each respective item included in such list) or a statement that the proposition contains no congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits;

(11) the changes in existing law (if any) shown in accordance with clause 3 of House Rule XIII;

(12) the determination required pursuant to section 5(b) of Public Law 92-463, if the legislation reported establishes or authorizes the establishment of an advisory committee;

(13) the information on Federal and inter-governmental mandates required by section 423(c) and (d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as added by the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995 (P.L. 104-4);

(14) a statement regarding the applicability of section 102(b)(3) of the Congressional Accountability Act, Public Law 104-1;

(15) a statement indicating whether any provision of the measure establishes or reauthorizes a program of the Federal Government known to be duplicative of another Federal program. The Statement shall at a minimum explain whether—

(A) any such program was included in any report from the Government Accountability Office to Congress pursuant to section 21 of Public Law 111-139; or

(B) the most recent catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, published pursuant to the Federal Program Information Act (Public Law 95-220, as amended by Public Law 98-169), identified other programs related to the program established or reauthorized by the measure; and

(16) a statement estimating the number of directed rule makings required by the measure.

(c) Supplemental, Minority, Additional, or Dissenting Views.—If, at the time of approval of any measure or matter by the Committee, any Member of the Committee gives notice of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views, all Members shall be entitled to not less than 2 subsequent calendar days (excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and legal holidays except when the House is in session on such date) in which to file such writing and signed views, with the Majority Staff Director of the Committee. When time guaranteed by this paragraph has expired (or if sooner, when all separate views have been received), the Committee may arrange to file its report with the Clerk of the House not later than 1 hour after the expiration of such time. All such views (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(1) and House Rule XIII, clause 3(a)(1)), as filed by one or more Members of the Committee, shall be included within and made a part of the report filed by the Committee with respect to that bill or resolution.

(d) Printing of Reports.—The report of the Committee on the measure or matter noted in paragraph (a) above shall be printed in a single volume, which shall:

(1) include all supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views that have been submitted by the time of the filing of the report; and

(2) bear on its cover a recital that any such supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views (and any material submitted under House Rule XII, clause 3(a)(1)) are included as part of the report.

(e) Immediate Printing; Supplemental Reports.—Nothing in this rule shall preclude—

(1) the immediate filing or printing of a Committee report unless timely request for the opportunity to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views has been made as provided by paragraph (c); or

(2) the filing by the Committee of any supplemental report on any bill or resolution that may be required for the correction of any technical error in a previous report made by the Committee on that bill or resolution.

(f) Availability of Printed Hearing Records.—If hearings have been held on any reported bill or resolution, the Committee shall make every reasonable effort to have the record of such hearings printed and available for distribution to the Members of the House prior to the consideration of such bill or resolution by the House. Each printed hearing of the Committee or any of its sub-

committees shall include a record of the attendance of the Members.

(g) Committee Prints.—All Committee or Subcommittee prints or other Committee or Subcommittee documents, other than reports or prints of bills, that are prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the Chairman of the Committee or the Committee prior to public distribution.

(h) Post Adjournment Filing of Committee Reports.—(1) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, an investigative or oversight report approved by the Committee may be filed with the Clerk at any time, provided that if a Member gives notice at the time of approval of intention to file supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views, that Member shall be entitled to not less than 7 calendar days in which to submit such views for inclusion with the report.

(2) After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the Chairman of the Committee may file at any time with the Clerk the Committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause 1(d)(1) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the Committee, provided that a copy of the report has been available to each Member of the Committee for at least 7 calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, additional, or dissenting views submitted by a Member of the Committee.

(i) Conference.—The Chairman is directed to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

RULE X.—OTHER COMMITTEE ACTIVITIES

(a) Oversight Plan.—Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the Chairman shall convene the Committee in a meeting that is open to the public and with a quorum present to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress. Such plans shall be submitted simultaneously to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform and to the Committee on House Administration. In developing such plans the Committee shall, to the maximum extent feasible—

(1) consult with other committees of the House that have jurisdiction over the same or related laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction, with the objective of ensuring that such laws, programs, or agencies are reviewed in the same Congress and that there is a maximum of coordination between such committees in the conduct of such reviews; and such plans shall include an explanation of what steps have been and will be taken to ensure such coordination and cooperation;

(2) review specific problems with Federal rules, regulations, statutes, and court decisions that are ambiguous, arbitrary, or nonsensical, or that impose severe financial burdens on individuals;

(3) give priority consideration to including in its plans the review of those laws, programs, or agencies operating under permanent budget authority or permanent statutory authority;

(4) have a view toward ensuring that all significant laws, programs, or agencies within its jurisdiction are subject to review at least once every 10 years; and

(5) include proposals to cut or eliminate programs, including mandatory spending programs, that are inefficient, duplicative, outdated, or more appropriately administered by State or local governments.

The Committee and its appropriate subcommittees shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the impact or probable impact of tax policies affecting subjects within its jurisdiction as provided in clause 2(d) of House Rule X. The Committee shall include

in the report filed pursuant to clause 1(d) of House Rule XI a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee under clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee and any recommendations made or actions taken thereon.

(b) Annual Appropriations.—The Committee shall, in its consideration of all bills and joint resolutions of a public character within its jurisdiction, ensure that appropriations for continuing programs and activities of the Federal government and the District of Columbia government will be made annually to the maximum extent feasible and consistent with the nature, requirements, and objectives of the programs and activities involved. The Committee shall review, from time to time, each continuing program within its jurisdiction for which appropriations are not made annually in order to ascertain whether such program could be modified so that appropriations therefor would be made annually.

(c) Budget Act Compliance: Views and Estimates (See Appendix B).—Not later than 6 weeks after the President submits his budget under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code, or at such time as the Committee on the Budget may request, the Committee shall, submit to the Committee on the Budget (1) its views and estimates with respect to all matters to be set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget for the ensuing fiscal year (under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974—see Appendix B) that are within its jurisdiction or functions; and (2) an estimate of the total amounts of new budget authority, and budget outlays resulting therefrom, to be provided or authorized in all bills and resolutions within its jurisdiction that it intends to be effective during that fiscal year.

(d) Budget Act Compliance: Recommended Changes.—Whenever the Committee is directed in a concurrent resolution on the budget to determine and recommend changes in laws, bills, or resolutions under the reconciliation process, it shall promptly make such determination and recommendations, and report a reconciliation bill or resolution (or both) to the House or submit such recommendations to the Committee on the Budget, in accordance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (See Appendix B).

(e) Conference Committees.—Whenever in the legislative process it becomes necessary to appoint conferees, the Chairman shall, after consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, determine the number of conferees the Chairman deems most suitable and then recommend to the Speaker as conferees, in keeping with the number to be appointed by the Speaker as provided in House Rule I, clause 11, the names of those Members of the Committee of not less than a majority who generally supported the House position and who were primarily responsible for the legislation. The Chairman shall, to the fullest extent feasible, include those Members of the Committee who were the principal proponents of the major provisions of the bill as it passed the House and such other Committee Members of the majority party as the Chairman may designate in consultation with the Members of the majority party. Such recommendations shall provide a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members no less favorable to the majority party than the ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members on the Committee. In making recommendations of Minority Party Members as conferees, the Chairman shall consult with the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee.

(f) Hearing on Waste, Fraud, and Abuse.—(1) The Committee, or a Subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following the establishment of the Committee on the topic of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs which the Committee may authorize.

(2) A hearing described in subparagraph (1) shall include a focus on the most egregious instances of waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement as documented by any report the Committee has received from a Federal Office of the Inspector General or the Comptroller General of the United States.

(g) Hearing on Agency Financial Statements.—The Committee or a Subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing in any session in which the Committee has received disclaimers of agency financial statements from auditors of any Federal agency that the Committee may authorize to hear testimony on such disclaimers from representatives of any such agency.

(h) Hearing on GAO High-Risk-List.—The Committee or a Subcommittee, shall hold at least one hearing on issues raised by reports issued by the Comptroller General of the United States indicating that Federal programs or operations that the Committee may authorize are at high risk for waste, fraud, and mismanagement, known as the 'high-risk-list' or the 'high-risk series'.

(i) Activities Report.—(1) Not later than January 2 of each odd-numbered year, the Committee shall submit to the House a report on the activities of the Committee. After adjournment sine die of the last regular session of a Congress, or after December 15 of an even-numbered year, whichever occurs first, the Chair may file the report, a copy of which shall be made available to each Member of the Committee for at least 7 calendar days, with the Clerk of the House at any time.

(2) Such report shall include separate sections summarizing the legislative and oversight activities of the Committee during that Congress.

(3) The oversight section of such report shall include a summary of the oversight plans submitted by the Committee pursuant to clause 2(d) of House Rule X, a summary of the actions taken and recommendations made with respect to each such plan, and a summary of any additional oversight activities undertaken by the Committee, and any recommendations made or actions taken with respect thereto.

RULE XI.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(a) Number and Composition.—There shall be such subcommittees as specified in paragraph (c) of this rule. Each of such subcommittees shall be composed of the number of Members set forth in paragraph (c) of this rule, including ex officio Members.¹ The Chairman may create additional subcommittees of an ad hoc nature as the Chairman determines to be appropriate subject to any limitations provided for in the House Rules.

(b) Ratios.—On each Subcommittee, there shall be a ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members which shall be consistent with the ratio on the full Committee. In calculating the ratio of majority party Members to minority party Members, there shall be included the ex officio Members of the subcommittees and ratios below reflect that fact.

(c) Jurisdiction.—Each Subcommittee shall have the following general jurisdiction and number of Members:

General Farm Commodities and Risk Management (22 members, 13 majority and 9 minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to commodities including barley, cotton, cottonseed, corn, grain sorghum, honey,

mohair, oats, other oilseeds, peanuts, pulse crops, rice, soybeans, sugar, wheat, and wool; the Commodity Credit Corporation; risk management policies and statutes, including Federal Crop Insurance; producer data and privacy issues.

Commodity Exchanges, Energy, and Credit (15 members, 9 majority and 6 minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to commodity exchanges; agricultural credit; rural development; energy; rural electrification.

Conservation and Forestry (15 members, 9 majority and 6 minority)—Policies and statutes relating to resource conservation, forestry, and all forests under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture.

Nutrition (22 members, 13 majority and 9 minority)—Policies and statutes relating to nutrition, including the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and domestic commodity distribution and consumer initiatives.

Biotechnology, Horticulture, and Research (15 members, 9 majority and 6 minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to horticulture, including fruits, vegetables, nuts, and ornamentals; bees; and organic agriculture; policies and statutes relating to marketing and promotion orders; pest and disease management; bioterrorism; adulteration and quarantine matters; research, education, and extension; and biotechnology.

Livestock and Foreign Agriculture (15 members, 9 majority and 6 minority)—Policies, statutes, and markets relating to all livestock, poultry, dairy, and seafood, including all products thereof; the inspection, marketing, and promotion of such commodities and products; aquaculture; animal welfare; grazing; foreign agricultural assistance and trade promotion.

(d) Referral of Legislation.—

(1)(a) In General.—All bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee shall be referred to all subcommittees of appropriate jurisdiction within 2 weeks after being referred to the Committee. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman may determine that the Committee will consider certain bills, resolutions, or other matters.

(b) Trade Matters.—Unless action is otherwise taken under subparagraph (3), bills, resolutions, and other matters referred to the Committee relating to foreign agriculture, foreign food or commodity assistance, and foreign trade and marketing issues will be considered by the Committee.

(2) The Chairman, by a majority vote of the Committee, may discharge a Subcommittee from further consideration of any bill, resolution, or other matter referred to the Subcommittee and have such bill, resolution or other matter considered by the Committee. The Committee having referred a bill, resolution, or other matter to a Subcommittee in accordance with this rule may discharge such Subcommittee from further consideration thereof at any time by a vote of the majority Members of the Committee for the Committee's direct consideration or for reference to another Subcommittee.

(3) Unless the Committee, a quorum being present, decides otherwise by a majority vote, the Chairman may refer bills, resolutions, legislation or other matters not specifically within the jurisdiction of a Subcommittee, or that is within the jurisdiction of more than one Subcommittee, jointly or exclusively as the Chairman deems appropriate, including concurrently to the subcommittees with jurisdiction, sequentially to the subcommittees with jurisdiction (subject to any time limits deemed appropriate), divided by subject matter among the subcommittees with jurisdiction, or to an ad hoc subcommittee appointed by the Chair-

man for the purpose of considering the matter and reporting to the Committee thereon, or make such other provisions deemed appropriate.

(e) Participation and Service of Committee Members on Subcommittees.—(1) The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member shall serve as ex officio Members of all subcommittees and shall have the right to vote on all matters before the subcommittees. The Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member may not be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum.

(2) Any Member of the Committee who is not a Member of the Subcommittee may have the privilege of sitting and nonparticipatory attendance at Subcommittee hearings or meetings in accordance with clause 2(g)(2) of House Rule XI. Such Member may not:

(i) vote on any matter;

(ii) be counted for the purpose of establishing a quorum;

(iii) participate in questioning a witness under the 5-Minute Rule, unless permitted to do so by the Subcommittee Chairman in consultation with the Ranking Minority Member or a majority of the Subcommittee, a quorum being present;

(iv) raise points of order; or

(v) offer amendments or motions.

(f) Subcommittee Hearings and Meetings.—

(1) Each Subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive evidence, and make recommendations to the Committee on all matters referred to it or under its jurisdiction after consultation by the Subcommittee Chairmen with the Committee Chairman. (See Committee Rule VIII.)

(2) After consultation with the Committee Chairman, Subcommittee Chairmen shall set dates for hearings and meetings of their subcommittees and shall request the Majority Staff Director to make any announcement relating thereto. (See Committee Rule VIII(b).) In setting the dates, the Committee Chairman and Subcommittee Chairman shall consult with other Subcommittee Chairmen and relevant Committee and Subcommittee Ranking Minority Members in an effort to avoid simultaneously scheduling Committee and Subcommittee meetings or hearings to the extent practicable.

(3) Notice of all Subcommittee meetings shall be provided to the Chairman and the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee by the Majority Staff Director.

(4) Subcommittees may hold meetings or hearings outside of the House if the Chairman of the Committee and other Subcommittee Chairmen and the Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee is consulted in advance to ensure that there is no scheduling problem. However, the majority of the Committee may authorize such meeting or hearing.

(5) The provisions regarding notice and the agenda of Committee meetings under Committee Rule II(a) and special or additional meetings under Committee Rule II(b) shall apply to Subcommittee meetings.

(6) If a vacancy occurs in a Subcommittee chairmanship, the Chairman may set the dates for hearings and meetings of the Subcommittee during the period of vacancy. The Chairman may also appoint an acting Subcommittee Chairman until the vacancy is filled.

(g) Subcommittee Action.—(1) Any bill, resolution, recommendation, or other matter forwarded to the Committee by a Subcommittee shall be promptly forwarded by the Subcommittee Chairman or any Subcommittee Member authorized to do so by the Subcommittee.

(2) Upon receipt of such recommendation, the Majority Staff Director of the Committee shall promptly advise all Members of the Committee of the Subcommittee action.

(3) The Committee shall not consider any matters recommended by subcommittees until 2 calendar days have elapsed from the date of action, unless the Chairman or a majority of the Committee determines otherwise.

(h) Subcommittee Investigations.—No investigation shall be initiated by a Subcommittee without the prior consultation with the Chairman of the Committee or a majority of the Committee.

RULE XII.—COMMITTEE BUDGET, STAFF, AND TRAVEL

(a) Committee Budget.—The Chairman, in consultation with the majority Members of the Committee, and the minority Members of the Committee, shall prepare a preliminary budget for each session of the Congress. Such budget shall include necessary amounts for staff personnel, travel, investigation, and other expenses of the Committee and subcommittees. After consultation with the Ranking Minority Member, the Chairman shall include an amount budgeted to minority Members for staff under their direction and supervision. Thereafter, the Chairman shall combine such proposals into a consolidated Committee budget, and shall take whatever action is necessary to have such budget duly authorized by the House.

(b) Committee Staff.—(1) The Chairman shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical employees of the Committee not assigned to the minority. The professional and clerical staff of the Committee not assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Chairman, who shall establish and assign the duties and responsibilities of such staff members and delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate. (See House Rule X, clause 9)

(2) The Ranking Minority Member of the Committee shall appoint and determine the remuneration of, and may remove, the professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority within the budget approved for such purposes. The professional and clerical staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the Ranking Minority Member of the Committee who may delegate such authority as he or she determines appropriate.

(3) From the funds made available for the appointment of Committee staff pursuant to any primary or additional expense resolution, the Chairman shall ensure that each Subcommittee is adequately funded and staffed to discharge its responsibilities and that the minority party is fairly treated in the appointment of such staff (See House Rule X, clause 6(d)).

(c) Committee Travel.—(1) Consistent with the primary expense resolution and such additional expense resolution as may have been approved, the provisions of this rule shall govern official travel of Committee Members and Committee staff regarding domestic and foreign travel (See House Rule XI, clause 2(n) and House Rule X, clause 8 (reprinted in Appendix A)). Official travel for any Member or any Committee staff member shall be paid only upon the prior authorization of the Chairman. Official travel may be authorized by the Chairman for any Committee Member and any Committee staff member in connection with the attendance of hearings conducted by the Committee and its subcommittees and meetings, conferences, facility inspections, and investigations which involve activities or subject matter relevant to the general jurisdiction of the Committee. Before such authorization is given there shall be submitted to the Chairman in writing the following:

(i) The purpose of the official travel;

(ii) The dates during which the official travel is to be made and the date or dates of the event for which the official travel is being made;

(iii) The location of the event for which the official travel is to be made; and

(iv) The names of Members and Committee staff seeking authorization.

(2) In the case of official travel of Members and staff of a Subcommittee to hearings, meetings, conferences, facility inspections and investigations involving activities or subject matter under the jurisdiction of such Subcommittee to be paid for out of funds allocated to the Committee, prior authorization must be obtained from the Subcommittee Chairman and the full Committee Chairman. Such prior authorization shall be given by the Chairman only upon the representation by the applicable Subcommittee Chairman in writing setting forth those items enumerated in clause (1).

(3) Within 60 days of the conclusion of any official travel authorized under this rule, there shall be submitted to the Committee Chairman a written report covering the information gained as a result of the hearing, meeting, conference, facility inspection or investigation attended pursuant to such official travel.

(4) Local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the Committee and its employees engaged in carrying out their official duties outside the United States, its territories or possessions. No appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of Members of the Committee or is employees in any country where local currencies are available for this purpose; and the following conditions shall apply with respect to their use of such currencies:

(i) No Member or employee of the Committee shall receive or expend local currencies for subsistence in any country at a rate in excess of the maximum per diem rate set forth in applicable Federal law; and

(ii) Each Member or employee of the Committee shall make an itemized report to the Chairman within 60 days following the completion of travel showing the dates each country was visited, the amount of per diem furnished, the cost of transportation furnished, and any funds expended for any other official purpose, and shall summarize in these categories the total foreign currencies and appropriated funds expended. All such individual reports shall be filed by the Chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

RULE XIII.—AMENDMENT OF RULES

These Rules may be amended by a majority vote of the Committee. A proposed change in these Rules shall not be considered by the Committee as provided in clause 2 of House Rule XI, unless written notice of the proposed change has been provided to each Committee Member 2 legislative days in advance of the date on which the matter is to be considered. Any such change in the Rules of the Committee shall be published in the Congressional Record within 30 calendar days after its approval.

ENDNOTES

1. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Committee serve as ex officio Members of the Subcommittees. (See paragraph (e) of this Rule).

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 295. An act to amend section 2259 of title 18, United States Code, and for other purposes, to the Committee on Judiciary.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on February 11, 2015, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 203. To direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for the conduct of annual evaluations of mental health care and suicide prevention programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs, to require a pilot program on loan repayment for psychiatrists who agree to serve in the Veterans Health Administration of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DENHAM. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 13, 2015, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

437. A letter from the Management Analyst, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Flock Delivery and Stages of Poultry Production (RIN: 0580-AB23) received February 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

438. A letter from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Defining Larger Participants of the International Money Transfer Market [Docket No.: CFPB-2014-0003] (RIN: 3170-AA25) received February 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

439. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations (Ottawa County, OH, and Incorporated Areas) [Docket ID: FEMA-2014-0002] received February 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

440. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Office of the Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 76.1506 of the Commission's Rules received February 6, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

441. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Cove and Daisy, Arkansas; Alamo, Georgia; Grayville, Illinois; Clayton, Louisiana; Harrison, Michigan; Alton, Missouri; Ennis, Montana; Buffalo, Erick, Haworth, Leedey, Reydon, Taloga, Thomas, and Wright City,

Oklahoma; Weinert, Texas; Boscobel, Owen, and Tigerton, Wisconsin) [MB Docket No.: 11-147] received January 26, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

442. A letter from the Director, ES/PL/PS, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule — Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Fort Wayne-Marion, IN, and Detroit, MI, Appropriated Fund Federal Wage System Wage Areas (RIN: 3206-AN06) received February 3, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

443. A letter from the Federal Liaison Officer, Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Miscellaneous Changes to Trademark Rules of Practice and the Rules of Practice in Filings Pursuant to the Protocol Relating to the Madrid Agreement Concerning the International Registration of Marks [Docket No.: PTO-T-2013-0026] (RIN: 0651-AC88) received January 12, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

444. A letter from the Secretary of the Commission, Bureau of Competition, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Revised Jurisdictional Thresholds for Section 8 of the Clayton Act received February 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

445. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; PILATUS Aircraft Ltd. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0770; Directorate Identifier 2014-CE-024-AD; Amendment 39-18064; AD 2015-01-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

446. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Aviation Training Device Credit for Pilot Certification; Withdrawal [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0987; Amdt. Nos.: 61-133, 141-18] (RIN: 2120-AK62) received February 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

447. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2014-0925; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-229-AD; Amendment 39-18066; AD 2014-25-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received January 30, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

448. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB rule — Gracia v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 2004-147 [AOD 2015-01] received February 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

449. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB rule — Estate of Martinez v. Commissioner, T.C. Memo. 2004-150 [AOD 2015-01] received February 9, 2015, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (for herself, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mrs. LOWEY):

H.R. 907. A bill to improve defense cooperation between the United States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 908. A bill to include the Santa Cruz Redwoods Public Lands in the California Coastal National Monument as a part of the National Landscape Conservation System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCCAUL (for himself, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. GRIFFITH, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. LANCE):

H.R. 909. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act with respect to expanding access for breakthrough drugs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan (for herself and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H.R. 910. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to provide eligibility under certain highway programs for projects for the installation of vehicle-to-infrastructure communication equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SIRES, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LANCE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 911. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to issue an order with respect to secondary cockpit barriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. McDERMOTT, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. HONDA):

H.R. 912. A bill to place a moratorium on permitting for mountaintop removal coal mining until health studies are conducted by the Department of Health and Human Services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. GRAYSON, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. PINGREE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. WELCH, Ms. TITUS, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. HONDA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, and Mr. CONYERS):

H.R. 913. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require that genetically engineered food and foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients be labeled accordingly; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. GRAHAM (for herself and Mr. BUCK):

H.R. 914. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to jointly operate the Federal Recovery Coordination Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELBENE (for herself, Ms.

BROWNLEY of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. POCAN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. FARR, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. ESTY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. ASHFORD, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. VARGAS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. HONDA, Ms. MENG, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 915. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend and expand the membership of the Advisory Committee on Minority Veterans to include veterans who are lesbian, gay, or bisexual and veterans who are transgender; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. BUSTOS (for herself, Mr.

THOMPSON of California, Ms. MENG, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. JONES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. EDWARDS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. ESTY, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DELANEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BUCHSON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KILMER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. GALLEGO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. SINEMA, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Ms. KUSTER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. SIRES, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. YOHO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. VELA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. KATKO, Mr. GUINTA, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. BERA, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. JUDY

CHU of California, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 916. A bill to require the purchase of domestically made flags of the United States of America for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. CHAFFETZ):

H.R. 917. A bill to provide for media coverage of Federal court proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIBERI, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. REICHERT, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. REED, Mr. SCHOCK, and Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 918. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to prevent concurrent receipt of unemployment benefits and Social Security disability insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. RUSH, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. TONKO, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. CARDENAS):

H.R. 919. A bill to amend title XXI of the Social Security Act to extend and improve the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LABRADOR (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. MASSIE):

H.R. 920. A bill to focus limited Federal resources on the most serious offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GUTHRIE (for himself, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. WOMACK):

H.R. 921. A bill to provide protections for certain sports medicine professionals who provide certain medical services in a secondary State; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ADAMS (for herself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. FUDGE):

H.R. 922. A bill to amend the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act of 2006 to provide enhanced academic and career training in science, technology, engineering, or mathematics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 923. A bill to allow reciprocity for the carrying of certain concealed firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOSAR (for himself, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. STEWART, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr.

LATTA, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. BARTON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. JONES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. POMPEO, and Mr. MILLER of Florida):

H.R. 924. A bill to require that the prevailing wage utilized for purposes of subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act), be determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AMODEI (for himself, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Ms. TITUS, and Mr. HARDY):

H.R. 925. A bill to promote conservation, improve public land, and provide for sensible development in Douglas County, Nevada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 926. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the provision of guide dogs to veterans blinded by a service-connected injury; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. TONKO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. SCHIFF, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. SIREs, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HONDA, Mr. SABLON, and Mr. MCGOVERN):

H.R. 927. A bill to prevent and reduce the use of physical restraint and seclusion in schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BOUSTANY (for himself, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. HARPER, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. DENHAM, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. ELLMERS, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COOK, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. LANCE, Mr. WOODALL, Mr. BARR, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. KLINE, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. REED, Mr. HANNA, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. JOLLY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. LATTA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AMODEI, Mrs. LUMMIS, Mr. ROKITA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. MESSER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. OLSON, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BURGESS, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. NUNES, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. LONG, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. DUFFY, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FLORES, Mr. COLE, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. HILL, Mr.

STEWART, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. BENISHEK, Mr. MULLIN, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. POSEY, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. SCHOCK, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. BARTON, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Mr. JONES, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. PERRY, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. FINCHER, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUTKEMEYER, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DENT, Mr. ALLEN, Mrs. NOEM, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HENSARLING, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. YODER, and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 928. A bill to repeal the annual fee on health insurance providers enacted by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself and Mr. LOEBACK):

H.R. 929. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in lobbying contacts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California (for herself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 930. A bill to recruit, support, and prepare principals to improve student academic achievement at eligible schools; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Ms. MENG):

H.R. 931. A bill to provide for approval of certain drugs and biological products indicated for use in a well-defined population of patients in order to address increases in bacterial resistance to drugs and biological products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. POCAN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. NADLER, Ms. LEE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. EDWARDS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. ESTY, Mr. KILMER, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. TITUS, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. CARSON of Indiana,

Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. ISRAEL, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. POLIS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. HAHN, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. MENG, Mr. HONDA, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, and Mr. TONKO):

H.R. 932. A bill to allow Americans to earn paid sick time so that they can address their own health needs and the health needs of their families; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. HONDA, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 933. A bill to amend the Head Start Act to ensure that all children in Head Start and Early Head Start programs are vaccinated, and allow exemptions only for children with underlying medical conditions, for whom vaccines are therefore medically contraindicated; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas (for himself, Mr. COHEN, and Mr. HINOJOSA):

H.R. 934. A bill to require any State which, after enacting a Congressional redistricting plan after a decennial census and apportionment of Representatives, enacts a subsequent Congressional redistricting plan prior to the next decennial census and apportionment of Representatives, to obtain a declaratory judgment or preclearance in the manner provided under section 5 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 in order for the subsequent plan to take effect; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. HAHN (for herself, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 935. A bill to establish a National Freight Network Trust Fund to improve the performance of the national freight network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HECK of Washington (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KILMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. SMITH of Washington):

H.R. 936. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to identify, declare, and respond to marine disease emergencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HINOJOSA (for himself and Mr. FATTAH):

H.R. 937. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Education to make grants to support early college high schools and other dual enrollment programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. JOLLY (for himself and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois):

H.R. 938. A bill to revise and extend provisions under the Garrett Lee Smith Memorial Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 939. A bill to require the Secretary of Education to use the excess revenue generated from the William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program to carry out the Federal Pell Grant Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mrs. BLACK (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. FLEMING, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. PITTS, Mr. JOLLY, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. AMASH, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. BUCK, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. KLINE, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. SMITH of Nebraska, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. RIBBLE, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. OLSON, Ms. FOX, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. LONG, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. BABIN, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. SHUSTER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. MESSER, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROE of Tennessee, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. POMPEO, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SALMON, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. BUCHANAN, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. MARINO, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. STEWART, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BYRNE, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. FLORES, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. YODER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. YOHIO, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUIZENGA of Michigan, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. HARPER, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 940. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to protect rights of conscience with regard to requirements for coverage of specific items and services, to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit certain abortion-related discrimination in governmental activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. KUSTER (for herself, Mr. GUINTA, and Ms. GABBARD):

H.R. 941. A bill to amend the Veterans Access, Choice, and Accountability Act of 2014 to extend the requirement of the Secretary to furnish hospital care and medical services

through non-Department of Veterans Affairs entities to veterans residing in certain locations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. BURGESS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. JONES, and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 942. A bill to reduce by one-half of one percent the discretionary budget authority of any Federal agency for a fiscal year if the financial statement of the agency for the previous fiscal year does not receive a qualified or unqualified audit opinion by an external independent auditor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS (for himself and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 943. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to repeal the requirement for employer disclosure of information on health care coverage of employees who are Medicare beneficiaries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LOBIONDO (for himself, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. POSEY, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, and Mr. JOLLY):

H.R. 944. A bill to reauthorize the National Estuary Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. LUMMIS (for herself, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. BEN RAY LUJAN of New Mexico, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. TIPTON):

H.R. 945. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to require the Secretary of the Interior to convey to a State all right, title, and interest in and to a percentage of the amount of royalties and other amounts required to be paid to the State under that Act with respect to public land and deposits in the State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself and Mr. PETERSON):

H.R. 946. A bill to make loans and loan guarantees under section 502 of the Railroad Revitalization and Regulatory Reform Act of 1976 available for implementing positive train control systems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MATSUI (for herself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 947. A bill to amend the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 to allow the rebuilding, without elevation, of certain structures that are located in areas having special flood hazards and are substantially damaged by fire, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, and Mr. ZINKE):

H.R. 948. A bill to reduce a portion of the annual pay of Members of Congress for the failure to adopt a concurrent resolution on the budget which does not provide for a balanced budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, Oversight and Government Reform, and

Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 949. A bill to establish the African Burial Ground International Memorial Museum and Educational Center in New York, New York, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 950. A bill to amend title 23, United States Code, to prohibit automated traffic enforcement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SALMON (for himself, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT):

H.R. 951. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to permit a State to require an applicant for voter registration in the State who uses the Federal mail voter registration application form developed by the Election Assistance Commission under such Act to provide documentary evidence of citizenship as a condition of the State's acceptance of the form; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 952. A bill to amend titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act to establish a minimum direct care registered nurse staffing requirement at nursing facilities and skilled nursing facilities under Medicare and Medicaid and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. MARINO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. JOYCE):

H.R. 953. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to award grants to address the national epidemics of prescription opioid abuse and heroin use; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exempt from the individual mandate certain individuals who had coverage under a terminated qualified health plan funded through the Consumer Operated and Oriented Plan (CO-OP) program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington (for himself, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. WALZ, Mr. TURNER, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. KLINE, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. NUGENT, Mr. COOK, Mr. BRIDENSTINE, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. BYRNE, Mr. ZINKE, and Mr. PASCRELL):

H.R. 955. A bill to authorize assistance and sustainment to the military and national security forces of Ukraine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the

Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. COFFMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 956. A bill to amend the Adam Walsh Child Protection and Safety Act of 2006 to require the Secretary of Defense maintain a registry of sexual offenders; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Mr. WALZ, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 957. A bill to require Senate confirmation of Inspector General of the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 958. A bill to posthumously award a Congressional gold medal to Clyde Kennard in recognition of his sacrifice for education equality; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 959. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study of the Medgar Evers House, located in Jackson, Mississippi, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. GIBBS, Mr. TURNER, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 960. A bill to designate the Department of Veterans Affairs community based outpatient clinic in Newark, Ohio, as the Daniel L. Kinnard Department of Veterans Affairs Community Based Outpatient Clinic; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TIBERI (for himself, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KIND, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. REED, Mr. ROSKAM, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, and Mr. BOUTSANY):

H.R. 961. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the subpart F exemption for active financing income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUELSKAMP (for himself, Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. JONES, Mr. LATTA, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. BABIN, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. FLORES, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. GIBBS):

H.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to marriage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REICHERT (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. COSTA):

H. Res. 108. A resolution expressing the sense of the House relating to the dispute be-

tween the Pacific Maritime Association and the International Longshore and Warehouse Union impacting operations of West Coast ports; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. CARSON of Indiana (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Michigan):

H. Res. 109. A resolution expressing support for the designation of February 28, 2015, as "Rare Disease Day"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. HOLDING (for himself, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GRAYSON, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida):

H. Res. 110. A resolution recognizing the self determination of Gibraltar to determine its status as a British Overseas Territory; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

5. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 70, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 42, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the States to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN:

H.R. 907.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 908.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2 of the Constitution.

By Mr. MCCAUL:

H.R. 909.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Sec. 8: "The Congress shall have Power To . . . regulate Commerce . . . among the several States . . ."

By Mrs. MILLER of Michigan:

H.R. 910.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H.R. 911.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. YARMUTH:

H.R. 912.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article 1 of the Constitution.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 913.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 3, of Section 8, of Article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. GRAHAM:

H.R. 914.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. DELBENE:

H.R. 915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. BUSTOS:

H.R. 916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. KING of Iowa:

H.R. 917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 9 that grants Congress the power to constitute inferior tribunals to the Supreme Court.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 918.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, to "provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States."

By Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 919.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

By Mr. LABRADOR:

H.R. 920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Per Article 1, Section 8, Clause 9, and Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution and the Fifth Amendment to the Constitution, Congress has the power to enact this proposed legislation to make reforms to federal criminal sentencing. The proposed legislation conforms to the norms of the Fifth Amendment with respect to due process.

By Mr. GUTHRIE:

H.R. 921.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow Money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to

Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high Seas, and Offences against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the Acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings;—And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. ADAMS:

H.R. 922.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution and Amendment XVI of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STUTZMAN:

H.R. 923.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Congress enacts this bill pursuant to Clause 3 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. GOSAR:

H.R. 924.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Because this legislation adjusts the formula the federal government uses to spend money on federal contracts, it is authorized by the Constitution under Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, which grants Congress its spending power.

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 925.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. AMODEI:

H.R. 926.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 1 (relating to providing for the general welfare of the United States) and clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress), and Article IV, Section 3, Clause 2 (relating to the power of Congress to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States).

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 927.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BOUSTANY:

H.R. 928.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 929.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 930.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 931.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 932.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Ms. ESHOO:

H.R. 933.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. AL GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 934.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1 sec. 8 cl. 18)

By Ms. HAHN:

H.R. 935.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. HECK of Washington:

H.R. 936.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: "Congress shall have power to . . . make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. HINOJOSA:

H.R. 937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Clauses 1 and 18 of Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. JOLLY:

H.R. 938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1, Section 8 of Article 1 of the United States Constitution which reads: "The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defense and General Welfare of the United States; but all Duties and Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States."

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, impost, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States; . . .

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among several states, and with the Indian tribes

By Mrs. BLACK:

H.R. 940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5: All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

By Ms. KUSTER:

H.R. 941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 (relating to the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, impost, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States) of the United States Constitution

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. LoBIONDO:

H.R. 944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. LUMMIS:

H.R. 945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3: The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or of any particular State.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Ms. MATSUI:

H.R. 947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 section 6 of the United States Constitution and the 27th Amendment to the United States Constitution

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clauses 1, 17, and 18.

By Mr. PERLMUTTER:

H.R. 950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SALMON:

H.R. 951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1: The times, places and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of choosing Senators.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H.R. 953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause I

By Mr. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress "to provide for the common Defence", "to raise and support Armies", "to provide and maintain a Navy" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces" as enumerated in Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution: Congress shall have the power to make

all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution [t]o make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi:

H.R. 959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 2 of Section 3 of Article IV of the Constitution: The Congress shall have the Power to dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the United States; and nothing in this Constitution shall be so construed as to Prejudice any Claims of the United States, or any particular State.

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

United States Constitution, Article I, Section 8

By Mr. TIBERI:

H.R. 961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill makes changes to existing law relating to Article 1, Section 7 which provides that "All bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives."

By Mr. HUELSKAMP:

H.J. Res. 32.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this joint resolution is based is found in Article V of the Constitution, which grants Congress the authority, whenever two thirds of both chambers deem it necessary, to propose amendments to the Constitution.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 131: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 169: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 222: Ms. KUSTER.

H.R. 228: Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.

H.R. 231: Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. DIAZ-BALART.

H.R. 232: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 238: Ms. MCCOLLUM and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 263: Mr. COHEN.

H.R. 265: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 280: Mr. COLE.

H.R. 281: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. HARDY.

H.R. 284: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 310: Mr. HENSARLING and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 359: Mr. HANNA, Mr. LANCE, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 379: Mr. LANCE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 381: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 402: Mr. HENSARLING.

H.R. 411: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 430: Mr. PERLMUTTER.

H.R. 439: Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 445: Mr. MESSER and Mr. HARDY.
H.R. 456: Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 473: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 485: Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 495: Mr. POLIS.
H.R. 516: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 524: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. HUELSKAMP, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 528: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 540: Mr. DeFAZIO.
H.R. 542: Mr. AMODEI.
H.R. 546: Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, and Mrs. HARTZLER.
H.R. 551: Mr. VELA, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. KAPTUR, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 571: Mr. COLE.
H.R. 578: Mr. HENSARLING, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 583: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 590: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 592: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Mr. PEARCE.
H.R. 599: Mrs. NOEM.
H.R. 602: Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CARNEY, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. PETERS, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KILMER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BUCSHON, and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 605: Mr. YODER and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 606: Mr. OLSON.
H.R. 613: Mr. KILMER and Mr. DELANEY.
H.R. 614: Mr. RIBBLE.
H.R. 625: Mr. POLLS, Mr. CARNEY, and Mr. ASHFORD.
H.R. 654: Mr. HANNA and Mr. WEBSTER of Florida.
H.R. 663: Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. HUELSKAMP.
H.R. 674: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 684: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
H.R. 699: Mr. FATTAH.
H.R. 700: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 703: Mr. JOLLY.
H.R. 709: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 727: Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. FARR, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. STEFANIK, and Ms. DeLAURO.
H.R. 750: Mr. GROTHMAN and Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 756: Mr. SABLAN.
H.R. 762: Mr. PERLMUTTER.
H.R. 768: Mr. ELLISON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 803: Mr. HENSARLING.
H.R. 814: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.

H.R. 824: Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 841: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
H.R. 846: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. POCAN, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COOPER, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HONDA, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H.R. 855: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. HARPER, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. KILMER.
H.R. 861: Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. HECK of Washington, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MENG, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIREN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DeFAZIO, Ms. DeGETTE, Ms. DeLAURO, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DUCKWORTH, Ms. ESTY, Mr. FARR, Mr. FATTAH, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. GALLEG0, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. HAHN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. HONDA, Mr. HOYER, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KIND, Ms. KUSTER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LOEBSACK, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of

New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. McDERMOTT, Mr. McNERNEY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PETERS, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. POCAN, Mr. POLIS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. EDWARDS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HIGGINS, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKAI, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. VELA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. WELCH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COSTA, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. PIERLUISI, Mr. SCHRADER, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 864: Mr. PETERS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 885: Ms. KUSTER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. MESSER, Mr. LoBIONDO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 902: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

H.J. Res. 1: Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FINCHER, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.J. Res. 2: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. FINCHER, Mr. HENSARLING, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.J. Res. 30: Mr. NOLAN.

H. Con. Res. 2: Mr. RANGEL and Ms. PLASKETT.

H. Res. 14: Mr. WELCH and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee.

H. Res. 15: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H. Res. 24: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. QUIGLEY.

H. Res. 26: Mr. LATTA.

H. Res. 54: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mr. MURPHY of Florida.

H. Res. 67: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H. Res. 93: Mr. JONES.